RESURRECTION AND PAROUSIA

SUPPLEMENTS TO

NOVUM TESTAMENTUM

EDITORIAL BOARD

C.K. Barrett, Durham - P. Borgen, Trondheim
J.K. Elliott, Leeds - H.J. de Jonge, Leiden
A.J. Malherbe, New Haven - M.J.J. Menken, Utrecht
D.P. Moessner, Atlanta - J. Smit Sibinga, Amsterdam

VOLUME LXXXIV

RESURRECTION AND PAROUSIA

A Traditio-Historical Study of Paul's Eschatology in 1 Corinthians 15

BY

JOOST HOLLEMAN

E.J. BRILL
LEIDEN · NEW YORK · KÖLN
1996

The paper in this book meets the guidelines for permanence and durability of the Committee on Production Guidelines for Book Longevity of the Council on Library Resources.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Holleman, Joost.
Resurrection and Parousia : a traditio-historical study of Paul's eschatology in I Corinthians 15 / by Joost Holleman.
p. cm. — (Supplements to Novum Testamentum, ISSN 0167-9732 ; v. 84)
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 9004105972 (alk. paper)
1. Bible. N.T. Corinthians, 1st, XV—Criticism, interpretation, etc. 2. Jesus Christ—Resurrection. 3. Eschatology—Biblical teaching. I. Title. II. Series.
BS2675.2.H65 1996
227'.206—dc20 96-5100
CIP

Die Deutsche Bibliothek - CIP-Einheitsaufnahme

[Novum testamentum / Supplements]
(Supplements to Novum testamentum. - Leiden ; New York ; Köln : Brill.
Früher Schriftenreihe
Fortlaufende Beiheftreihe zu : Novum testamentum
NE: HST
Vol. 84. Holleman, Joost : Resurrection and Parousia. – 1996
Holleman, Joost.:
Resurrection and Parousia : a traditio-historical study of Paul's eschatology in 1 Corinthians 15 / by Joost Holleman. – Leiden ; New York ; Köln : Brill, 1996
(Supplements to Novum testamentum ; Vol. 84)
ISBN 90-04-10597-2

ISSN 0167-9732
ISBN 90 04 10597 2

© Copyright 1996 by E.J. Brill, Leiden, The Netherlands

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by E.J. Brill provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910 Danvers MA 01923, USA. Fees are subject to change.

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface IX

Abbreviations XI

Introduction 1
a. The problem under discussion; plan of the present study 1
b. History of research 4

PART ONE

PAUL'S EXPOSITION OF THE ESCHATOLOGICAL RESURRECTION IN 1 CORINTHIANS 15 33

I. Introductory Problems 35
a. The denial of the resurrection 35
b. Structure and argumentation 40
II. The Eschatological Resurrection and Jesus' Resurrection 49
a. Jesus as the first-fruits of the dead 49
b. Jesus' resurrection as the beginning of the eschatological resurrection 52
c. The eschatological resurrection as participation in Jesus' resurrection 55
III. The Eschatological Resurrection and Jesus' Parousia 58
a. Paul's scenario of the last events 58
b. The defeat of death 63

PART TWO

THE COINCIDENCE OF THE ESCHATOLOGICAL RESURRECTION AND JESUS' PAROUSIA 67

IV. The Idea of the Eschatological Resurrection Coinciding with Jesus' Parousia 69
V. The Christian Expectation of the Eschatological Resurrection 77
a. The earliest traceable Christian concept of the eschatological resurrection 77
b. The Jewish tradition of the eschatological resurrection 85
c. The rise of the Christian expectation of the eschatological resurrection 87

VI. The Expectation of Jesus' Parousia 95
a. The earliest traceable form of the expectation of Jesus' parousia 95
b. The Jewish tradition of the expectation of the coming of God's heavenly eschatological agent 103
c. The rise of the expectation of Jesus' parousia 115
VII. The Origin of the Idea of the Eschatological Resurrection Coinciding with Jesus' Coming 123
a. The rise of the idea that the eschatological resurrection will take place at the time of Jesus' parousia 123
b. Analogies in Jewish eschatology of the Graeco-Roman period 125

PART THREE

JESUS' RESURRECTION AS THE BEGINNING OF THE ESCHATOLOGICAL RESURRECTION 131

VIII. The Idea of Jesus' Resurrection as the Beginning of the Eschatological Resurrection 133
IX. The Belief in Jesus' Resurrection 139
a. The earliest traceable phraseology and ideas concerning the belief in Jesus' resurrection 139
b. The origin of the belief in Jesus' resurrection 144
X. The Origin of the Idea of Jesus' Resurrection as the Beginning of the Eschatological Resurrection 158
a. The rise of the idea that Jesus' resurrection is the beginning of the eschatological resurrection 158
b. Analogies in contemporary Jewish thought 162

PART FOUR

THE ESCHATOLOGICAL RESURRECTION AS A PARTICIPATION IN JESUS' RESURRECTION 165

XI. The Idea of the Eschatological Resurrection as a Participation in Jesus' Resurrection 167
XII. The Concept of the Christians' Unity with Christ 174
a. Abraham, Adam, and Jesus as representative figures 174
b. Jesus' atoning death 181
XIII. The Origin of the Idea of the Eschatological Resurrection as a Participation in Jesus' Resurrection 185

XIV. Pauline Themes Related to the Idea that the Eschatological Resurrection Will Be a Participation in Jesus' Resurrection 188
a. Dying and rising with Christ 188
b. The eschatological association with Christ 198

Summary and Conclusions 203

Bibliography 209

Index locorum 225

PREFACE

The present study is a revision of my Ph.D. thesis which was accepted at Leiden University in November 1995.

I would like to thank my promoters, Prof. Dr. H.J. de Jonge and Prof. Dr. M. de Jonge for the inspiring guidance and meticulous criticism which they have given to me and my work. Such teachers most students can only wish for.

I am also grateful to the other members of the New Testament staff at Leiden University, Dr. H.W. Hollander, Dr. J. Tromp, Dr. L.J. Lietaert Peerbolte, and Mr. B.W.J. de Ruyter, M.Div., whose company I was privileged to enjoy during the time of my research. Their fellowship and careful counsel have been a blessing both for my research and myself.

Finally, I would like to thank Mr. D.G. Powers, M.Div., M.A., for his correction of the English; Prof. Dr. A.J. Malherbe and Prof. Dr. D.P. Moessner for accepting this book in the Supplement Series of *Novum Testamentum*; and Dr. D.E. Orton of E.J. Brill for publishing the book.

ABBREVIATIONS

a. *Sources*

Bible (including apocrypha)

Col.	Colossians	4 Macc.	4 Maccabees
1 Cor.	1 Corinthians	Matt.	Matthew
2 Cor.	2 Corinthians	Num.	Numbers
Dan.	Daniel	1 Pet.	1 Peter
Deut.	Deuteronomy	2 Pet.	2 Peter
Eccl.	Ecclesiastes	Phil.	Philippians
Eph.	Ephesians	Ps(s).	Psalm(s)
Exod.	Exodus	Rev.	Revelation
Ezek.	Ezekiel	Rom.	Romans
Gal.	Galatians	1 Sam.	1 Samuel
Gen.	Genesis	2 Sam.	2 Samuel
Heb.	Hebrews	Sir.	Jesus Sirach
Hos.	Hosea	1 Thess.	1 Thessalonians
Isa.	Isaiah	2 Thess.	2 Thessalonians
Jas.	James	1 Tim.	1 Timothy
Jer.	Jeremiah	2 Tim.	2 Timothy
2 Kgs.	2 Kings	Tob.	Tobit
Lev.	Leviticus	Wis.	Wisdom of Solomon
1 Macc.	1 Maccabees	Zech.	Zechariah
2 Macc.	2 Maccabees	Zeph.	Zephaniah

Jewish literature

Pseudepigrapha

2 Apoc. Bar.	Greek Apocalypse of Baruch
Gr. Apoc. Esdrae	Greek Apocalypse of Ezra
Apoc. Mos.	Apocalypse of Moses (Greek Life of Adam and Eve)
As. Mos.	Assumption of Moses
Bib. Ant.	Biblical Antiquities of Pseudo-Philo
Jub.	Jubilees
Ps.-Phoc.	Pseudo-Phocylides
Ps. Sol.	Psalms of Solomon
Sib. Or.	Sibylline Oracles
T. Job	Testament of Job

Philo and Josephus

Josephus, *Ant. Jud.*	Flavius Josephus, *Antiquitates Judaicae*
——, *Bell. Jud.*	——, *De bello Judaico*
——, *Cont. Ap.*	——, *Contra Apionem*
Philo, *Sac.*	Philo of Alexandria, *De sacrificiis Abelis et Caini*

Qumran

1QM	War Scroll
11QMelch.	11Q Melchizedek

Early Christian literature

Barn.	Epistle of Barnabas
2 Clem.	2 Clement
Ignatius, *Eph.*	Ignatius, *Epistle to the Ephesians*
——, *Magn.*	——, *Epistle to the Magnesians*
——, *Pol.*	——, *Epistle to Polycarp*
——, *Rom.*	——, *Epistle to the Romans*
——, *Smyr.*	——, *Epistle to the Smyrnaeans*
Justin, *Apol.*	Justin Martyr, *Apologia*
——, *Dial.*	—— , *Dialogus cum Tryphone*
Mart. Andreae	Martyrdom of Andrew
Mart. Pauli	Martyrdom of Paul
Mart. Pionii	Martyrdom of Pionius
Mart. Pol.	Martyrdom of Polycarp
Polycarp, *Phil.*	Polycarp, *Epistle to the Philippians*

b. *Reference works*

ABD	D.N. Freedman *et alii* (eds.), *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, 6 vols. (New York: Doubleday, 1992).
AOT	H.F.D. Sparks (ed.), *The Apocryphal Old Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984).
Bauer	W. Bauer, *Griechisch-deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der frühchristlichen Literatur* (Berlin/New York: W. de Gruyter, 6th edition by K. Aland and B. Aland, 1988).
BDR	F. Blass, A. Debrunner, F.W. Rehkopf, *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, [16]1984).
EWNT	H. Balz, G. Schneider (eds.), *Exegetisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, 3 vols. (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1980-1983).
LSJ	H.G. Liddell, R. Scott, H.S. Jones, *A Greek-English Lexicon* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, [9]1940, with a supplement, 1968).
OTP	J.H. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, 2 vols. (Garden City: Doubleday, 1983-1985).
PRE	*Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, 72 vols. (Stuttgart: Metzler, München: Druckenmüller, Neuausgabe von G. Wissowa *et alii*, 1894-1980).
ThWNT	G. Kittel, G. Friedrich (eds.), *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, 10 vols. (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1933-1979).
TRE	G. Krause, G. Müller (eds.), *Theologische Realenzyklopädie* 24 vols. to date (Berlin/New York: W. de Gruyter, 1977-).

c. *Bibliographical abbreviations*

AThANT	Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments
BBB	Bonner biblische Beiträge

BET	Beiträge zur biblischen Exegese und Theologie
BEThL	Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum Lovaniensium
BEvTh	Beiträge zur evangelischen Theologie
BGBE	Beiträge zur Geschichte der biblischen Exegese
Bib	*Biblica*
BICS	*Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies of the University of London*
BiH	Biblische Handbibliothek
BJRL	*Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*
BNTC	Black's New Testament Commentaries
BU	Biblische Untersuchungen
BZ	*Biblische Zeitschrift*
BZNW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft
CB.NT	Coniectanea biblica New Testament Series
CBQ	*Catholic Biblical Quarterly*
CSCO.Aeth	Corpus scriptorum Christianorum orientalium Scriptores Aethiopici
DSD	*Dead Sea Discoveries*
EKK	Evangelisch-katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament
EtB	Études bibliques
EvTh	*Evangelische Theologie*
FRLANT	Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments
FThL	Forum theologiae linguisticae
fzb	Forschungen zur Bibel
FZPhTh	*Freiburger Zeitschrift für Philosophie und Theologie*
GNT	Grundrisse zum Neuen Testament (NTD Ergänzungsreihe)
GTA	Göttinger theologische Arbeiten
HBK	Herders Bibelkommentar
HNT	Handbuch zum Neuen Testament
HSM	Harvard Semitic Monographs
HThK	Herders theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament
HThR	*Harvard Theological Review*
HThS	Harvard Theological Studies
ICC	International Critical Commentary on the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments
JBL	*Journal of Biblical Literature*
JBTh	*Jahrbuch für biblische Theologie*
JJS	*Journal of Jewish Studies*
JSHRZ	Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit
JSJ	*Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic and Roman Period*
JSNT	*Journal for the Study of the New Testament*
JSNT.S	Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series
JSPE.S	Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series
JThS	*Journal of Theological Studies*
KEK	Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament
LCL	Loeb Classical Library
LingBibl	*Linguistica biblica*
MSSNTS	Society of New Testament Studies Monograph Series
NIC	New International Commentary
NIGTC	New International Greek Testament Commentary
NovT	*Novum Testamentum*

NovT.S	Supplements to Novum Testamentum
NTA	Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen
NTD	Das Neue Testament Deutsch
NTLi	New Testament Library
NTS	*New Testament Studies*
NTTS	New Testament Tools and Studies
PGC	Pelican Gospel Commentaries
PVTG	Pseudepigrapha Veteris Testamenti graece
QD	Quaestiones disputatae
RB	*Revue biblique*
RdQ	*Revue de Qumran*
SBL.DS	Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series
SBL.MS	Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series
SBS	Stuttgarter Bibelstudien
SC	Sources chrétiennes
SJTh	*Scottish Journal of Theology*
SQS	Sammlung ausgewählter kirchen- und dogmengeschichtlicher Quellenschriften
SSN	Studia semitica Neerlandica
StNT	Studien zum Neuen Testament
StPB	Studia post-biblica
StUNT	Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments
SvTK	*Svensk teologisk Kvartalskrift*
SVTP	Studia in Veteris Testamenti pseudepigrapha
TB	Theologische Bücherei
ThHK	Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament
ThQ	*Theologische Quartalschrift*
ThR	*Theologische Rundschau*
ThRv	*Theologische Revue*
ThTh	Themen der Theologie
ThW	Theologische Wissenschaft
ThZ	*Theologische Zeitschrift*
TNT	Texte zum Neuen Testament (NTD Textreihe)
VT	*Vetus Testamentum*
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
WdF	Wege der Forschung
WMANT	Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
ZKTh	*Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie*
ZNW	*Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*
ZRGG	*Zeitschrift für Religions- und Geistesgeschichte*
ZThK	*Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*

d. *General abbreviations*

col(s).	column(s)	LXX	Septuagint
ed(s).	edited by, editor(s)	n.F.	neue Folge
diss.	dissertation	n.s.	new series
esp.	especially	v.l.	varia lectio
FS	Festschrift		

INTRODUCTION

a. *The problem under discussion; plan of the present study*

(1) In the spring of the year 55, some four years after he had left the Christian community of Corinth, Paul felt compelled to address the Corinthian community with regard to several abuses and problems that had arisen there and differences of opinion between them and himself. One of the views Paul wanted to correct was the denial of the eschatological resurrection by some of the Corinthians (1 Cor. 15:12). In Paul's thorough reply to this denial, which was to be his most extensive exposition of the eschatological resurrection handed down to us, the themes of Jesus' resurrection and his parousia play a very important role.

Paul starts off by using the existence of the belief in Jesus' resurrection, a belief shared by the Corinthian Christians, to argue that there will be an eschatological resurrection: because Jesus has been raised there will be a resurrection at the end of time (vv. 1-19). The relationship thus established between the two resurrections is portrayed in the following passage (vv. 20-23) in two ways: (a) Jesus has been raised as *the first* of those who have fallen asleep, which means that his resurrection is the first stage and that of Christians the second stage of the eschatological resurrection (vv. 20, 23); (b) Jesus has been raised as *the representative* of those who will be raised, which means that the dead in Christ will be made alive through their unity with him (vv. 21-22). These ideas do not only function as arguments in favour of the view that there will be an eschatological resurrection, but they explain at the same time how, in Paul's view, the eschatological resurrection will take place. Because Jesus has been raised as the first and as the representative of all those who will be raised, the resurrection of the others must necessarily follow; this resurrection will take place through participation in Jesus' resurrection.

Paul continues by connecting the eschatological resurrection to the parousia of Jesus: the resurrection will happen at the time of Christ's coming, when he will defeat the enemies, the last of whom is death, and hand over the kingdom to God (vv. 23-28). By connecting the eschatological resurrection to Jesus' parousia, Paul makes it clear that man will not attain everlasting bliss before the end of time. Apparently, the

question of precisely when this bliss would become reality was one of the issues between Paul and those who denied the eschatological resurrection. By relating the believers' resurrection to Jesus' coming Paul gives it a place within the expectation of the eschatological future.

Thus, Paul's exposition of the eschatological resurrection in verses 20-23 is centred around three ideas: (a) the idea that Jesus' resurrection is the beginning of the eschatological resurrection; (b) the idea that the eschatological resurrection will occur through participation in Jesus' resurrection; (c) the idea that the eschatological resurrection will take place at the time of Jesus' parousia. In the context of Paul's debate with the Corinthians these ideas are understandable. Yet when one examines the traditio-historical background of each of these ideas, they prove to be formed by combining several notions stemming from various traditions.

Paul's idea that Jesus' resurrection is the beginning of the eschatological resurrection turns out to be a fusion of two different concepts of resurrection stemming from two distinct traditions. The belief in Jesus' resurrection, on the one hand, was the belief that Jesus had been raised (a) into heaven, (b) soon after his death, and (c) individually. This belief, as will be argued, stems from the Jewish tradition concerning the heavenly vindication of the martyr. The eschatological resurrection, on the other hand, was thought to take place (a) on earth, (b) at the end of time, and (c) to be the lot of a relatively large number of people who would rise from the dead collectively. Thus, the eschatological resurrection is a different kind of resurrection than Jesus' martyrological resurrection. It is one of the many elements which formed the scenario of the end of days in Jewish eschatological thought. Consequently, the idea that Jesus' resurrection is the beginning of the eschatological resurrection is a somewhat forced connection of two traditions concerning different types of resurrection. The question, therefore, is how could Paul integrate these different traditions into the idea that Jesus' resurrection is the beginning of the eschatological resurrection?

In the idea that the eschatological resurrection will take place through participation in Jesus' resurrection different ideas are connected as well. In this concept Jesus' resurrection is seen as an experience in which he represents others, an event in which all Christians share. The basis of this idea is the conviction that Christians are united with Christ, a conviction found throughout Paul's epistles and expressed in various turns of phrase. Sometimes the Christian community is designated as 'the body of Christ'. Then again Christians are said to

live or act 'in Christ' or 'through Christ'. In 1 Corinthians 15 the concept of the Christians' unity with Christ is expressed in different ways; for instance, in the image of the risen Jesus as the first-fruits (representative) of all the others to be raised. However, since traditionally the notion of unity between the one who is raised and others does not belong to the concept of resurrection, whether martyrological or eschatological, the question should be asked how Paul could apply this concept of unity to that of the resurrection, interpreting the eschatological resurrection as part of Jesus' resurrection.

Finally, in the idea that the eschatological resurrection will happen at the time of Jesus' parousia, Paul explicitly connects two eschatological expectations: future resurrection and Jesus' second coming. Although the origin of both expectations is to be found in Jewish eschatology, they are rarely related to each other in Jewish writings, let alone in the way they are connected in 1 Cor. 15:23. The question, therefore, is how these expectations found their way into Christianity and how they became so closely connected as is the case in 1 Cor. 15:23.

(2) This study will offer a traditio-historical analysis of each of these three ideas which are so central in Paul's exposition of the eschatological resurrection in 1 Corinthians 15. In the first part of this study a short exegesis of the relevant sections of 1 Corinthians 15 will be carried out. Then, in parts two, three, and four, a traditio-historical analysis of each of the three ideas mentioned above will be given. Contrary to the order in which the ideas come up in 1 Corinthians 15, the idea that the eschatological resurrection will take place at the time of Jesus' parousia will be examined first (part two). Subsequently, the idea that Jesus' resurrection is the beginning of the eschatological resurrection (part three) and, finally, the idea that the eschatological resurrection will come about through participation in Jesus' resurrection will be treated (part four). By examining first the idea that the eschatological resurrection will take place at Jesus' parousia, one will obtain an overall view of Paul's eschatology. Ultimately, this overall view will contribute considerably to a better understanding of the origin of the other two ideas.

b. *History of research*

(1) Scholarly research on Jesus' resurrection, the eschatological resurrection, and Jesus' parousia has resulted in an overwhelming amount of literature. A review of this research must therefore be confined to the most important studies on the subjects mentioned and particularly to those that give special attention to Paul's ideas as found in 1 Cor. 15:20-23.

(2) Paul's idea that Jesus' resurrection is the beginning of the eschatological resurrection has only rarely been subjected to a traditio-historical analysis. Most scholars have not deemed such an analysis necessary because, in their view, Jesus' resurrection should be understood as part of the eschatological resurrection from the beginning onwards. That is, they assumed that Jesus' followers believed from the beginning that the resurrection, which they and many other Jews expected to take place at the end of time, had already been realized for Jesus. Thus, according to these scholars, Jesus' resurrection can be looked upon as the beginning of the eschatological resurrection as Paul does. The notion that Jesus has been raised as 'the first-fruits of those who have fallen asleep' (1 Cor. 15:20) was no more than an image—an almost natural explication of a belief with which only the Corinthians were not familiar.

J. Weiss, for instance, despite writing extensively on 1 Corinthians and the beginnings of Christianity,[1] commented only briefly on Paul's idea that Jesus has been raised as the first of those who have fallen asleep. Weiss argued that, in the view of Jesus' followers, Jesus' resurrection was at the same time his exaltation as heavenly messiah. The apostles perceived that Jesus appeared to them as the exalted messiah to whom God had given all authority and power (1 Cor. 15:5-7). They believed that God's kingdom, i.e., the new aeon, had already begun with the resurrection and exaltation of Jesus. Consequently, the eschatological resurrection had begun with Jesus' resurrection; the image of the risen Jesus as the first-fruits implies that the resurrection of the others will follow.[2]

However, the image of the first-fruits is not as unambiguous and clear as Weiss thought it was. Paul uses it to connect two events which, also in Paul's view, are distinguished in time, place, and character. Jesus has been raised soon after his death, but Christians will be raised at

[1] J. Weiss, *Der erste Korintherbrief* (KEK; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1910); J. Weiss, *Das Urchristentum* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1917).

[2] J. Weiss, *Urchristentum*, pp. 413-414; J. Weiss, *Korintherbrief*, p. 356.

the end of time, that is, after a certain period during which they have been dead. Furthermore, Jesus has been raised into heaven, but Christians will be raised on earth. Finally, Jesus' resurrection was something that involved only him, whereas the eschatological resurrection will concern a relatively large number of people who will rise collectively. Weiss did not notice that the notion that Jesus has been raised as the first-fruits of those who have fallen asleep reflects a rather forced connection of two dissimilar events. Consequently, he disregarded the question of how Paul could have integrated these dissimilar events into the idea that the one is the first stage of a process ending with the second. In short, Weiss did not examine Paul's idea of Jesus' resurrection as the beginning of the eschatological resurrection because he saw the belief in Jesus' resurrection as belonging to and stemming from the expectation of the eschatological resurrection.

The view on the origin of the belief in Jesus' resurrection as represented by Weiss is still generally accepted. In the debate on the belief in Jesus' resurrection, which flared up again in the nineteen-fifties and which has continued up to the present, this view has hardly been challenged.[1] The debate has been dominated by questions regarding the character of the appearances and the question of the empty tomb. What is at stake is the reality of Jesus' resurrection as a historical event. The view that the belief in Jesus' resurrection originated from the Jewish tradition of the eschatological resurrection has either been taken for granted[2] or has been further substantiated.

---

[1] For information about this debate in previous centuries, see P. Hoffmann, 'Die historisch-kritische Osterdiskussion von H.S. Reimarus bis zu Beginn des 20. Jahrhunderts', in: P. Hoffmann (ed.), *Zur neutestamentlichen Überlieferung von der Auferstehung Jesu* (WdF 522; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1988), pp. 15-67.

[2] For instance: E. Fascher, 'Anastasis-Resurrectio-Auferstehung. Eine programmatische Studie zur Thema "Sprache und Offenbarung"', *ZNW* 40 (1941), pp. 166-229, esp. 200; J. Sint, 'Parusie-Erwartung und Parusie-Verzögerung im paulinischen Briefcorpus', *ZKTh* 86 (1964), pp. 47-79, esp. 69-70; J. Kremer, *Das älteste Zeugnis von der Auferstehung Christi. Eine bibeltheologische Studie zur Aussage und Bedeutung von 1 Kor 15,1-11* (SBS 17; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1966); W. Marxsen, 'Die Auferstehung Jesu als historisches und als theologisches Problem', in: W. Marxsen, U. Wilckens, G. Delling, H.G. Geyer, *Die Bedeutung der Auferstehungsbotschaft für den Glauben an Jesus Christus* (Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1966), pp. 9-39, esp. 24; W. Marxsen, *Die Auferstehung Jesu von Nazareth* (Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1968); S.H. Hooke, *The Resurrection of Christ as History and Experience* (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1967); F. Mussner, *Die Auferstehung Jesu* (BiH 7; München: Kösel Verlag, 1969); F.F. Bruce, 'Paul on Immortality', *SJTh* 24 (1971), pp. 457-475, esp. 461; J. Baumgarten, *Paulus und die Apokalyptik. Die Auslegung apokalyptischer Überlieferungen in den echten Paulusbriefen* (WMANT 44; Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1975), p. 126; K.M. Fischer, *Das Ostergeschehen* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978, ²1980), pp. 55, 91, 97; D.C. Allison, *The End of the Ages Has Come. An Early In-*

An example of the latter category of studies is an article by U. Wilckens.[1] Wilckens identified the accounts of the appearances of the Lord in 1 Cor. 15:5-7 as apocalyptic visions. Traditionally, such visions reveal information about the eschatological events and oftentimes this information concerns the eschatological resurrection (Dan. 12:1-3; 1 Enoch 22, 51; Isa. 26). Thus, Wilckens argued, the recipients of the apocalyptic visions in which Jesus appeared concluded that Jesus already shared in the nearby eschatological resurrection. The idea that the eschatological resurrection had already been accorded to one individual was new and became characteristic of the Christian faith.[2]

Also new and characteristic, according to Wilckens, was the soteriological meaning given to Jesus' resurrection: Jesus' resurrection will bring along the resurrection of the believers. Jesus has been raised as the first-fruits (ἀπαρχή) and thus the rest must and will follow. Wilckens set out that this soteriological meaning attributed to Jesus' resurrection arose from the conviction that Jesus was not only raised, but at the same time exalted as eschatological-soteriological Lord. Early Christians came to this conviction in accordance with traditions of exalted heavenly saviours such as the Son of Man as found in 1 Enoch 37-71.[3] The combination of resurrection and exaltation necessarily made Jesus' resurrection an eschatological event.[4] And because Jesus' resurrection was seen as a soteriological and an eschatological event, Paul can immediately link the eschatological resurrection to Jesus' resurrec-

---

terpretation of the Passion and Resurrection of Jesus (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1987 [Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985]), pp. 67-68, 80-82; B. Lindars, 'The Sound of the Trumpet: Paul and Eschatology', *BJRL* 67 (1984-85), pp. 766-782, esp. 775; C. Rowland, *Christian Origins. An Account of the Setting and Character of the Most Important Messianic Sect of Judaism* (London: SPCK, 1985), p. 187; I. Broer, '"Seid stets bereit, jedem Rede und Antwort zu stehen, der nach der Hoffnung fragt, die euch erfüllt" (1 Petr 3,15). Das leere Grab und die Erscheinungen Jesu im Lichte der historischen Kritik', in: I. Broer, J. Werbich (eds.), *"Der Herr ist wahrhaft auferstanden" (Lk 24,34). Biblische und systematische Beiträge zur Entstehung des Osterglaubens* (SBS 134; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1988), pp. 29-61; P. Hoffmann, *Auferstehung* (II/1), *TRE*, vol. IV (1979), pp. 478-513, esp. 487; G. Lüdemann, *Die Auferstehung Jesu. Historie, Erfahrung, Theologie* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994), p. 213.

[1] U. Wilckens, 'Der Ursprung der Überlieferung der Erscheinungen des Auferstandenen. Zur traditionsgeschichtlichen Analyse von 1. Kor. 15,1-11', in: W. Joest, W. Pannenberg (eds.), *Dogma und Denkstrukturen* (FS E. Schlink; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963), pp. 56-95; U. Wilckens, *Auferstehung. Das biblische Auferstehungszeugnis historisch untersucht und erklärt* (ThTh 4; Stuttgart/Berlin: Kreuz-Verlag, 1970).

[2] U. Wilckens, 'Ursprung', pp. 87-88.

[3] U. Wilckens, 'Ursprung', p. 90.

[4] The idea that Jesus' resurrection was an eschatological event appears throughout the oldest Christian preaching, according to Wilckens; U. Wilckens, 'Ursprung', p. 92, cf. p. 89.

tion. As a matter of fact, Paul points out in 1 Cor. 15:12-19 that the resurrection of Jesus and the eschatological resurrection are one and the same eschatological event; they are intrinsically connected because denying the one leads to denying the other.[1]

The view that the belief in Jesus' resurrection was originally the belief in a proleptic eschatological resurrection initiated by Jesus' appearances seems, at first sight, legitimate. On closer examination, however, this view raises the question of how the earliest Christians, without seeing or experiencing the rest of the resurrection or other eschatological events, could conclude from appearances that the eschatological resurrection had begun. Inferring a resurrection from an appearance is possible, as other accounts of appearances show, but then always the resurrection of an individual and not the eschatological resurrection.[2]

Furthermore, the view that Paul bases the belief in Jesus' resurrection on the expectation of the eschatological resurrection, as 1 Cor. 15:12-19 shows according to Wilckens, cannot be maintained. Paul connects the two resurrections in these verses in order to prove the reality of the (future) eschatological resurrection and not Jesus' resurrection.[3] Moreover, every time Paul establishes a relationship between Jesus' resurrection and the eschatological resurrection he does so in order to convince his audience of the reality of the eschatological resurrection and never of the reality of Jesus' resurrection.[4]

This difficult issue of how the belief in the one resurrection could serve as foundation for the belief in the other, was the topic of a study by G. Kegel.[5] Following the traditional view, Kegel maintained that from the earliest beginnings Jesus' resurrection was seen as the 'realization of God's eschatological salvation for Jesus' and thus as the beginning of the eschatological resurrection. According to Kegel the 'late Jewish apocalyptic notion of resurrection,' which was part of the everyday world-view among Jews in the time of Jesus and Paul, formed the basis of the belief in Jesus' resurrection.[6] In later times, more specifically in the time of Luke, when the resurrection of Jesus lost its obvious basis, the resurrection of Jesus was founded on the tes-

---

[1] U. Wilckens, 'Ursprung', pp. 61-62.

[2] See, for instance, the examples of resurrections 'proved' by appearances listed in K. Berger, C. Colpe, *Religionsgeschichtliches Textbuch zum Neuen Testament* (TNT 1; Göttingen/Zürich: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1987), pp. 89-95.

[3] See chapter I, pp. 41-43.

[4] See 1 Thess. 4:14; 1 Cor. 6:14; Rom. 6:5, 8; 8:11.

[5] G. Kegel, *Auferstehung Jesu - Auferstehung der Toten. Eine traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zum Neuen Testament* (Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1970).

[6] G. Kegel, *Auferstehung*, p. 25.

timony of trustworthy witnesses. Furthermore, since from Luke's time the expectation of an eschatological resurrection did not belong to the common world-view of Jews anymore, Luke based the future resurrection of the believers on Jesus' resurrection. In the beginning, Kegel concluded, the belief in the resurrection of the dead was the 'self-evident basis' of the belief in the resurrection of Jesus; in later times, however, the belief in the resurrection of Jesus was the basis of the belief in the eschatological resurrection.[1]

Kegel's most important contribution to the debate was the second part of his conclusion, which, however, is only partly true; namely, insofar as the founding of the belief in the eschatological resurrection on the belief in Jesus' resurrection is indeed a secondary development. Kegel assumed that this development started with Luke, but it is clear that Paul already argues this way in 1 Cor. 15:12-19. The first part of Kegel's conclusion, which concurs with the traditional view, cannot be maintained at all. The origin of the belief in Jesus' resurrection cannot be explained as stemming from the traditional Jewish expectation of the eschatological resurrection as if it were an individual, proleptic realization of the eschatological resurrection.

A major alteration of the view that the origin of the belief in Jesus' resurrection is to be explained with the help of the Jewish tradition of the eschatological resurrection was proposed by those scholars who argued that the tradition of the exaltation of a suffering righteous one should be taken into account. With reference to this tradition E. Schweizer tried to explain why Jesus in particular was believed to have received such a resurrection.[2] According to Schweizer, Jesus' followers regarded him as a truly righteous person, someone who had suffered and died in full obedience to God. Moreover, Jesus was seen as *the* suffering righteous one, the final (eschatological) righteous one who had fulfilled the suffering of all the previous righteous ones and brought about eternal reconciliation. For this reason God had not only exalted him from the dead, but also enthroned him to be his Son, the Lord, and the Son of Man. As a result, Jesus' exaltation (resurrection) and enthronization were seen as the beginning of the eschatological events including the eschatological resurrection.[3]

---

[1] G. Kegel, *Auferstehung*, p. 120.

[2] E. Schweizer, *Erniedrigung und Erhöhung bei Jesus und seinen Nachfolgern* (AThANT 28; Zürich: Zwingli, 1955).

[3] E. Schweizer, *Erniedrigung*, p. 70; E. Schweizer, *Theologische Einleitung in das Neue Testament* (GNT 2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989), pp. 20-21, 29-30.

L. Ruppert refined Schweizer's view. Ruppert criticized Schweizer for confusing motifs of various traditions, such as Jesus' exaltation (resurrection) from the dead and his enthronement as Son of Man.[1] He argued that the tradition of the exaltation of the suffering righteous one is sufficient by itself to explain the origin of the belief in Jesus' resurrection. Ruppert set out the development of this tradition and argued that in apocalyptic circles, under the influence of the tradition of the eschatological resurrection as found in Dan. 12:1-3, the notion of resurrection was incorporated in the tradition of the exaltation of the suffering righteous one.[2] In those circles, the exaltation of the righteous one was pictured as a resurrection, the 'eschatological resurrection of the suffering righteous one.' In short, the tradition of the eschatological resurrection was absorbed into that of the exaltation of the suffering righteous one, for instance in Wisdom 2-5, and it was this combination of traditions which formed the background against which Jesus' followers interpreted what had happened to Jesus.[3]

Although Schweizer and Ruppert tried to explain the genesis of the belief in Jesus' resurrection with the help of the tradition of the suffering and exalted righteous one, they continued to explain the belief in Jesus' resurrection mainly by appealing to the tradition of the eschatological resurrection. With the help of Dan. 12:1-3 the exaltation of the righteous one is characterized as the eschatological resurrection. Besides, Ruppert's interpretation of the exaltation of the suffering righteous one in Wisdom 2-5 is not really correct. The exaltation of the righteous one in Wisdom 2-5 is not pictured as the eschatological resurrection, but as the immortality which is rewarded soon after death.[4] This idea of exaltation does not have its origin in the tradition of the eschatological resurrection, but in the tradition of the immortality of the soul and in that of the heavenly vindication of the martyr.[5] Thus, Ruppert's description of the exaltation of the suffering righteous in

---

[1] L. Ruppert, *Jesus als der leidende Gerechte? Der Weg Jesu im Lichte eines alt- und zwischentestamentlichen Motivs* (SBS 59; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1972), pp. 42-44, 66-67, 72-75; L. Ruppert, 'Erhöhungsvorstellungen im Alten Testament', *BZ* 22 n.F. (1978), pp. 199-220.

[2] L. Ruppert, *Leidende Gerechte*, p. 40; L. Ruppert, 'Erhöhungsvorstellungen', pp. 218-219.

[3] L. Ruppert, 'Erhöhungsvorstellungen', pp. 219-220.

[4] Wis. 3:1-6; 4:10-15; see also chapter IX, pp. 149-152.

[5] U. Kellermann, *Auferstanden in den Himmel. 2 Makkabäer 7 und die Auferstehung der Märtyrer* (SBS 95; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1979), p. 103. For a more detailed examination of the tradition of the heavenly vindication of the martyr, including its occurrence in Wisdom 2-5, see chapter IX, pp. 145-157.

Wisdom 2-5, as well as that of the tradition of the suffering righteous in general, fail to carry conviction. And even if they did, it remains incorrect to understand the belief in the resurrection of Jesus as the belief in the eschatological resurrection.[1]

Only a few scholars have tried to explain the origin of the belief in Jesus' resurrection without resorting to the tradition of the eschatological resurrection. The first author to be mentioned here is G. Haufe.[2] Haufe's starting point was the fact that Jesus' resurrection is often pictured as his enthronization, more specifically as his appointment as Son of Man. Jesus himself expected this appointment and talked about it in hidden terms. Consequently, after his death it was believed that Jesus was taken up to become the heavenly Son of Man. This belief arose in accordance with the tradition concerning the rapture of Enoch who became Son of Man (1 Enoch 71). Thus, Jesus' resurrection was originally seen as a rapture. If one accepts this explanation, Haufe argued, one does not need the idea that Jesus' resurrection was an 'individual, premature eschatological resurrection,' an idea unparalleled in Jewish eschatology and thus not useful.[3]

A necessary condition for Haufe's view, as he admitted, was that the Son of Man sayings, in particular those referring to his death and res-

---

[1] The Schweizer-Ruppert thesis that the origin of the belief in Jesus' resurrection must be explained with the help of both the tradition of the eschatological resurrection and that of the exaltation of the suffering righteous one has received many adherents. A. Vögtle, for instance, has advocated Ruppert's position, attacking those who only use the concept of the eschatological resurrection to explain the origin of the belief in Jesus' resurrection. These are his arguments: (a) the causal relationship which Paul assumes between the two resurrections in 1 Cor. 15:20, 23 is secondary; (b) the eschatological resurrection takes place on earth, whereas Jesus appeared from heaven; (c) there are no parallels in Judaism for a preliminary eschatological resurrection of an individual; A. Vögtle, R. Pesch, *Wie kam es zum Osterglauben* (Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1975), pp. 110-113. Other adherents include: P. Seidensticker, *Die Auferstehung Jesu in der Botschaft der Evangelisten. Ein traditionsgeschichtlicher Versuch zum Problem der Sicherung der Osterbotschaft in der apostolischen Zeit* (SBS 26; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1967), pp. 15-24; H.P. Hasenfratz, *Die Rede von der Auferstehung Jesu Christi. Ein methodologischer Versuch* (FThL 10; Bonn: Linguistica Biblica, 1975), p. 178; H.-H. Schade, *Apokalyptische Christologie bei Paulus. Studien zum Zusammenhang von Christologie und Eschatologie in den Paulusbriefen* (GTA 18; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981, ²1984), pp. 162-168; H. Merklein, 'Die Auferweckung Jesu und die Anfänge der Christologie (Messias bzw. Sohn Gottes und Menschensohn)', *ZNW* 72 (1981), pp. 1-26, esp. 3-4; P. Perkins, *Resurrection: New Testament Witness and Contemporary Reflection* (London: Chapman, 1984), pp. 37-56, 71-87.

[2] G. Haufe, 'Entrückung und eschatologische Funktion im Spätjudentum', *ZRGG* 13 (1961), pp. 105-113.

[3] G. Haufe, 'Entrückung', p. 112. Cf. K. Schubert's review of Marxsen's book (*Die Auferstehung Jesu von Nazareth*, see above) in: *Kairos* 11 n.F. (1969), pp. 145-149, esp. 147-148, who makes a similar remark.

urrection, are authentic words of Jesus. This last point is often questioned. Even more problematic for Haufe's thesis is the fact that all traditions concerning Jesus' resurrection speak of a resurrection from the dead and not of a rapture, which is a different concept.

A more important attempt to explain the origin of the belief in Jesus' resurrection without the help of the tradition of the eschatological resurrection was offered by K. Berger.[1] Berger argued that Jesus' followers interpreted his death and resurrection in line with the tradition of the death and resurrection of the pre-eschatological prophet. According to this (supposed) tradition, God's final prophet, after being killed by men, is raised by God as a sign of his power with which he will judge in the nearby eschaton. Berger reconstructed this alleged Jewish, pre-Christian tradition by examining many Jewish and Christian writings in which this tradition was adopted.[2] His main source and point of departure was Rev. 11:3-13, the story about God's two witnesses, identified by Berger as Elijah and Enoch, who died a violent death but were made alive again and elevated to heaven by way of a rehabilitation and a warning against those who had killed them. Accordingly, Berger argued, the earliest response to Jesus' death which asserted that God had raised him, must be seen as the expression of the belief in the 'legitimation of Jesus by a sign of power of God which was at the same time the proof of the guilt of his murderers.'[3]

Berger's characterization of the earliest belief in Jesus' resurrection in terms of the rehabilitation of the pre-eschatological prophet made

---

[1] K. Berger, *Die Auferstehung des Propheten und die Erhöhung des Menschensohnes. Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zur Deutung des Geschicks Jesu in frühchristlichen Texten* (StUNT 13; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1976); my translation. Already before the publication of Berger's book, R. Pesch made use of and defended Berger's ideas in his article, 'Zur Entstehung des Glaubens an die Auferstehung Jesu', *ThQ* 153 (1973), pp. 201-228; see also A. Vögtle, R. Pesch, *Osterglauben*. Pesch' view will not be discussed separately since Pesch withdrew his support of Berger's ideas in his inaugural address in Freiburg i. Br. (30.10.1980), 'Zur Entstehung des Glaubens an die Auferstehung Jesu. Ein neuer Versuch', *FZPhTh* 30 (1983), pp. 73-98.

[2] His use of Christian material to reconstruct a Jewish, pre-Christian tradition was criticized even before the book was published; see the literature mentioned in the preface of Berger's book, pp. 5-6. In theory it is possible that younger writings contain old traditions which are not found in older writings. Yet these younger writings should only be used as extra evidence to reconstruct a tradition which is also attested by older sources. If not, one never leaves the realm of sheer speculation. Berger leans too heavily on material which is too young; cf. J.M. Nützel, 'Zum Schicksal der eschatologischen Propheten', *BZ* 20 n.F. (1976), pp. 59-94. See also the criticism of M. Hengel, 'Ist der Osterglaube noch zu retten?', *ThQ* 153 (1973), pp. 252-269.

[3] K. Berger, *Auferstehung*, pp. 146-147; of course Berger argues that Rev. 11:3-13 is not influenced by traditions concerning Jesus' resurrection (p. 39).

him recognize that Paul's idea that Jesus' resurrection is the beginning of the eschatological resurrection entailed a traditio-historical problem. Because Jesus' resurrection was not originally viewed as a proleptic eschatological resurrection,[1] the question should be posed: how could Paul come to regard Jesus' resurrection as the beginning of the eschatological resurrection? Berger started by explaining that the image of the first-fruits in 1 Cor. 15:20 was not used by Paul to explain a chronological order between the two resurrections, but an order in rank, thus an order of importance. The idea that the eschatological resurrection of the righteous ones would happen in an order of importance was common, according to Berger. He listed several passages, regrettably all fairly young, in which it is said that the patriarchs will be raised first because they are regarded to be the most righteous of the righteous ones.[2] What the author of Revelation calls the 'first' resurrection (Rev. 20:4-6), i.e., the resurrection of special righteous persons before the messianic kingdom—as opposed to the resurrection of all people after the messianic kingdom and before the final judgement—is that 'first' resurrection of the patriarchs. In Rev. 11:3-13 this 'first' resurrection is limited to the two witnesses, Elijah and Enoch. In analogy with the tradition recorded in Rev. 11:3-13, according to Berger, Jesus was called the first-fruits as the result of the limitation of the 'first' resurrection to Jesus.[3]

Berger's analysis of Paul's idea of Jesus' resurrection as the beginning of the eschatological resurrection calls forth three remarks. First of all, the idea that the so-called 'first' resurrection, the resurrection of the most righteous ones, was limited to Jesus is not supported anywhere in Paul's epistles. Secondly, the idea that the eschatological resurrection will happen in an order of importance is not a 'common idea' in the time of Jesus and Paul, as Berger argued. The passages which he enumerated are either too vague or too late (and some undoubtedly Christian) to be taken into account. Finally, Berger's interpretation of the image of the first-fruits as an order of importance and not as a chronological order is forced. 1 Cor. 15:23 clearly shows that Paul meant a chronological order.

---

[1] Berger vigorously challenged this opinion. He set out that Paul combined two different concepts of resurrection in 1 Cor. 15:20. Berger's arguments were: (a) Jesus' resurrection concerns an individual event; (b) Jesus was not raised to live an everlasting life on earth but was raised into heaven (pp. 15, 248-253, notes 44, 45, 48).

[2] K. Berger, *Auferstehung*, pp. 251-253, note 48.

[3] K. Berger, *Auferstehung*, p. 143.

Nevertheless, Berger's attempt to explain the rise of the belief in Jesus' resurrection with the help of traditions concerning other non-eschatological resurrections of individuals is helpful. His expositions, however, are unduly complicated because he adopted Rev. 11:3-13 as his point of departure. This set him on the wrong track. There is indeed a Jewish, pre-Christian tradition concerning the non-eschatological resurrection of individuals to which also Jesus' resurrection belongs. But this tradition should not be classified as that of the 'rehabilitation of the pre-eschatological prophet' as Berger did, but as that of the heavenly vindication of the martyr.[1] Berger did acknowledge the existence of a martyrological tradition, at least to some extent, but he regarded it to be an earlier stage of the tradition of the pre-eschatological prophet. Berger wanted to uphold the category of the pre-eschatological prophet because it 'describes best the fact that mission, message, claim, and legitimation are at stake.'[2] Berger did so not only because he found these characteristics in the two witnesses in Rev. 11:3-13, his main source, but also because it allowed him to make a link between the 'pre-eschatological prophet' and the pre-Easter Jesus. However, the category of the pre-eschatological prophet is not attested in writings before Rev. 11:3-13, and thus it is doubtful whether Berger's tradition of the pre-eschatological prophet existed at all in the time of Jesus.

The tradition of the heavenly vindication of the martyr, especially its occurrence in 2 Maccabees 7, has been examined by U. Kellermann.[3] He argued that the martyrs in 2 Maccabees 7 receive an individual 'transcendental-heavenly' resurrection, i.e., a resurrection immediately after death in a new body in heaven. By raising the martyrs from the dead and by giving them a place in heaven, God vindicates and rehabilitates those who die because of their faith in him. This martyrological resurrection should be distinguished from the traditional 'eschatological-earthly' resurrection as found in Dan. 12:2 and Isa. 26:19.[4] From the time of its earliest attestation in 2 Maccabees 7

---

[1] See the remarks on U. Kellermann and H.J. de Jonge below; see also chapter IX, pp. 145-157.

[2] K. Berger, *Auferstehung*, p. 423, note 628; my translation.

[3] U. Kellermann, *Auferstanden in den Himmel. 2 Makkabäer 7 und die Auferstehung der Märtyrer* (SBS 95; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1979).

[4] According to Kellermann the concept of resurrection in 2 Maccabees 7 is an *Umprägung* of Dan. 12:2, probably also influenced by non-Jewish conceptions of afterlife (pp. 64-66, 81-83); see also his article: 'Überwindung des Todesgeschicks in der alttestamentlichen Frömmigkeit vor und neben dem Auferstehungsglauben', *ZThK* 73 (1976), pp. 259-282.

this tradition spread in Jewish and Christian writings,[1] according to Kellermann; for instance, in the passages in which Paul expresses his longing for his own martyrdom (Phil. 1:23; 3:10), but also in Luke's account of the Easter event (Luke 22-24). Kellermann ended his book by posing the question if Jesus himself saw his life and death in the framework of martyr-theology, i.e., if Jesus expected his resurrection after a possible violent death. Kellermann answered in the affirmative. However, before one can possibly answer this question one should examine the oldest material available in order to see how Jesus' followers looked upon Jesus' resurrection.[2]

H.J. de Jonge did what Kellermann failed to do: he examined the oldest material on Jesus' resurrection and compared it with the language used in the Jewish tradition of the resurrection of the martyr.[3] De Jonge starts out by examining the earliest Christian use of the verbs ἀνιστάναι (and the cognate noun ἀνάστασις) and ἐγείρειν and the formulaic expressions in which these verbs appear in Paul's letters. He also looks at the so-called 'contrast scheme' in Luke-Acts. After comparing language and ideas in early Christian tradition, on the one hand, and Jewish literature, on the other, De Jonge concludes that the earliest Christians indeed interpreted Jesus' ministry and death in accordance with the tradition of the martyr and, as a result, ascribed a heavenly

---

[1] The idea of an individual resurrection also influenced the Jewish tradition of the suffering righteous one, as Wisdom 2-5 shows; U. Kellermann, *Auferstanden*, pp. 102-110; see above. As a result the two traditions are very similar; see the excerpts of the discussion of a symposium on martyrology in: J.W. van Henten (ed., in cooperation with B.A.G.M. Dehandschutter and H.J.W. van der Klaauw), *Die Entstehung der jüdischen Martyrologie* (StPB 38; Leiden/New York/København/Köln: E.J. Brill, 1989), pp. 220-261. With regard to the influence of both traditions on the earliest interpretations of Jesus' death, one can still make distinctions, although both have been applied from the earliest beginnings, as M. de Jonge has shown. For instance, Jesus' suffering was interpreted with the help of the tradition of the suffering righteous one, whereas the idea of Jesus' resurrection was the result of the application of the tradition of the martyrs on Jesus; M. de Jonge, *Jesus, The Servant-Messiah* (New Haven/London: Yale University Press, 1991), pp. 32-48.

[2] Kellermann only notes, in this respect, that the view that Jesus was attributed a heavenly vindication is a very old view but that it was soon replaced, as for instance the gospel of Luke shows, by the view of the death and resurrection of the Son of Man, a view hard to distinguish from the view of the heavenly vindication of the martyr; U. Kellermann, *Auferstanden*, p. 134; cf. p. 64; U. Kellermann, 'Das Danielbuch und die Märtyrertheologie der Auferstehung', in: J.W. van Henten (ed.), *Entstehung*, pp. 51-75, esp. 59-69.

[3] H.J. de Jonge, 'De opstanding van Jezus. De joodse traditie achter een christelijke belijdenis', in: T. Baarda, H.J. de Jonge, M.J.J. Menken (eds.), *Jodendom en vroeg Christendom: continuïteit en discontinuïteit* (Kampen: Kok, 1991), pp. 47-61.

resurrection to him.[1] Although De Jonge admits that the same language is also used for the description of the eschatological resurrection, he maintains that it is impossible that the earliest Christians regarded Jesus' resurrection as the eschatological resurrection because the latter always concerns a group of people and not an individual. The idea that Jesus' resurrection is the beginning of the eschatological resurrection (1 Cor. 15:20) is a secondary notion if only because of the difference in time of at least twenty years between the two events. Paul's connection of the two resurrections can be explained as the outcome of the coalescence of three ideas: (a) Jesus was raised as a martyr in heaven; (b) during his terrestrial ministry Jesus had inaugurated the eschaton as messiah/Christ; (c) in the eschaton all who belonged to God's people would be raised. Thus, according to De Jonge, the martyrological resurrection of Jesus inevitably came to be regarded as an eschatological fact, and consequently, as the beginning of the eschatological resurrection.[2]

Although De Jonge's explanation of the relationship between the eschatological resurrection and Jesus' resurrection needs elaboration, his thesis about the origin of the belief in Jesus' resurrection carries conviction and will be followed in this study. The earliest followers of Jesus, including Paul, looked upon Jesus' resurrection as that of a martyr. They were convinced that he had been taken up to heaven soon after his death and that he had received there a new body. Jesus' resurrection was not originally seen as the beginning of or as part of the eschatological resurrection; the relationship between the two resurrections expressed in 1 Cor. 15:20 is secondary. The question, therefore, is how did Paul come to combine these two dissimilar events into the idea that Jesus' resurrection is the beginning of the eschatological resurrection?

(3) In the last five decades Paul's idea of the eschatological resurrection of believers as a participation in Jesus' resurrection has been the subject of traditio-historical research rather frequently. However, this research did not always include the study of 1 Cor. 15:20-22. Most examinations concentrated on particular expressions, for instance, the phrase 'with Christ' (σὺν Χριστῷ) and derivations of this phrase. Since in 1 Cor. 15:20-22 the idea that the eschatological resurrection will take place through participation in Jesus' resurrection is phrased in language that

---

[1] For a more detailed exposition of this view, see chapter IX, pp. 139-157.
[2] H.J. de Jonge, 'Opstanding', pp. 52-53.

has no parallel elsewhere, this passage has either been overlooked or deliberately left out.

The solutions proposed for explaining the origin of Paul's idea of the eschatological resurrection as a participation in Jesus' resurrection can be categorized in the following way. One group of scholars argued that the idea is an elaboration of the notion of the eschatological association with Christ. Because a Christian will be 'with Christ' at the time of Jesus' parousia, he or she will also be 'raised with Christ.' Another group of scholars maintained that Paul's idea originated from the concept of the unity of Christians with Christ, a unity which specifically concerns Jesus' death and resurrection as, for instance, Paul's discussion of the ritual of baptism shows. Since a Christian has died and risen with Christ in baptism, he will also be raised with Christ at the end of time.

An advocate of the former view is E. Schweizer.[1] He argued, following J. Dupont,[2] that the idea that Christians will be 'with Christ' (σὺν Χριστῷ) at the end of time, as expressed in, e.g., 1 Thess. 4:17,[3] stems from the Jewish tradition of the eschatological association of the righteous ones with the eschatological agent (and/or God). The Jewish idea that at the end of time all righteous ones will live in community with the eschatological agent (and/or God) led to the expectation that when Jesus comes at the end of time, all believers would live in community with him. According to Schweizer, the idea of the eschatological association with Christ was extended by Paul in such a way as to include the resurrection of the Christians with Christ (2 Cor. 4:14; 13:4; Rom. 6:8).[4]

Paul intended to stay in line with the traditional idea of the eschatological association, according to Schweizer. In Rom. 6:1-11, where Paul emphasizes that this resurrection with Christ will not take place before the end of time, Paul is reacting to so-called 'enthusiasts' who believed that such a resurrection with Christ had already taken place in baptism. Paul contends that through baptism a person has indeed died

---

[1] E. Schweizer, 'Die "Mystik" des Sterbens und Auferstehens mit Christus bei Paulus', in: E. Schweizer, *Beiträge zur Theologie des Neuen Testaments. Neutestamentliche Aufsätze (1955-1970)* (Zürich: Zwingli, 1970), pp. 183-203; this is a slightly revised version of his article, 'Dying and Rising with Christ', *NTS* 14 (1967-68), pp. 1-14.

[2] J. Dupont, *ΣΥΝ ΧΡΙΣΤΩΙ. L'union avec le Christ suivant Saint Paul. Première partie: 'Avec le Christ' dans la vie future* (Bruges/Louvain/Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1952).

[3] Other passages listed by Schweizer: 1 Thess. 5:10; 2 Cor. 13:4; Phil. 1:23; Rom. 6:8b; Col. 3:4; Rev. 3:20.

[4] E. Schweizer, 'Mystik', pp. 183-184.

with Christ, but the resurrection with Christ is still to be received in the future (Rom. 6:5, 8). Until then a Christian (only) walks in newness of eternal life, which Paul defines in ethical terms. The eschatological association with Christ, including a resurrection with him, will only be realized at the end of time.[1]

But the view that in Rom. 6:1-11 Paul reacts to a (pre-Pauline) tradition according to which a person has already risen with Christ in baptism cannot be sustained.[2] The most important evidence supporting this view is post-Pauline, namely Col. 2:11-17. There is not enough reason to support the thesis that Paul in Rom. 6:1-11 emphasizes the eschatological character of a resurrection with Christ in response to a pre-Pauline tradition according to which the resurrection with Christ has already occurred.[3]

Schweizer's overall view founders on the fact that there is an essential difference between the idea of an eschatological association with Christ and that of a resurrection with Christ. This difference concerns the nature of the unity meant in these two ideas. The eschatological association with Christ is a communion with Christ, a living in the presence of Christ. However, the unity through which Christians participate in Jesus' resurrection is based on representation. The idea that people who are 'in Christ' will share in Jesus' resurrection means that Jesus represented all Christians in his resurrection. This essential difference in the kind of unity intended in the two ideas prevents one from seeing the two as stemming from one and the same tradition.[4]

In his book on Paul's idea of 'living with Christ' at the end of time, P. Siber, too, followed Dupont's view regarding the Jewish origin of this idea.[5] However, in opposition to Schweizer, Siber argued that Paul's idea of an eschatological resurrection with Christ does not stem from the tradition concerning the association of an eschatological agent's followers with the agent himself. At the most it is Paul's contribution to this tradition. Paul's idea of rising with Christ in the eschaton is unparalleled, according to Siber. It has its origin in Paul's conception

---

[1] E. Schweizer, 'Mystik', pp. 192-193.

[2] According to Schweizer this 'enthusiastic' view was also present in Corinth: Paul reacts in 1 Cor. 6:9-11 in the same way as in Rom. 6:1-11; E. Schweizer, 'Mystik', pp. 189, 193.

[3] See A.J.M. Wedderburn, *Baptism and Resurrection. Studies in Pauline Theology against Its Graeco-Roman Background* (WUNT 44; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1987), pp. 37-69.

[4] For a more detailed discussion of these two ideas, see chapter XIV, pp. 198-202.

[5] P. Siber, *Mit Christus leben. Eine Studie zur paulinischen Auferstehungshoffnung* (AThANT 61; Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1971), p. 253.

of Jesus' death and resurrection. Jesus' death and resurrection were seen by Paul as eschatological and vicarious events: Jesus died and rose once and for all. Because these events are proleptic eschatological, Christians may have the hope that they will rise as well when they have died.[1]

Despite Siber's refined analysis of the eschatological 'with Christ' sayings in the Pauline epistles, his explanation of the origin of the idea of 'rising with Christ in the eschaton' is unconvincing. Jesus' resurrection was not seen as a vicarious event like his death. Paul never speaks about Jesus' resurrection as something which happened 'once and for all.' Furthermore, the idea that Jesus' death was a vicarious event can be proved to be based on Jewish traditions. However, there are no grounds for the assertion that there also existed a tradition which led to the belief that Jesus' resurrection was a vicarious event. If Paul nonetheless regards Jesus' resurrection as an event in which Christians participate, one should look for a special explanation; the tradition from which the belief in Jesus' resurrection stems does not offer any.

The other way in which scholars have tried to explain the origin of the idea that the eschatological resurrection will take place through participation in Jesus' resurrection is by arguing that it developed from the concept of the unity between Christ and Christians. More than once and in various ways Paul expresses the idea that Christians are united with Christ. More specifically, this unity often is a unity in Jesus' death and resurrection as, for instance, Paul's discussion of baptism shows.

H. Molitor[2] argued that, in Paul's view, people can only be raised if they live in a mystical union with Christ and possess the Spirit. Both are the results of baptism, which is a symbolical representation of Jesus' death and resurrection. The final effect of baptism is, in accordance with Jesus' death and resurrection, an eternal life received through resurrection (Rom. 6:1-11).[3] Thus, in Molitor's view, Paul created the idea of the eschatological resurrection with Christ on the basis of his view of baptism as a symbolical resurrection with Christ.

---

[1] P. Siber, *Mit Christus leben*, p. 96.

[2] H. Molitor, *Die Auferstehung der Christen und Nichtchristen nach dem Apostel Paulus* (NTA XVI.1; Münster i. W.: Aschendorff, 1933). Not many monographs on Paul's ideas regarding the eschatological resurrection have appeared since Molitor's; the second part of H.C.C. Cavallin, *Life after Death. Paul's Argument for the Resurrection of the Dead in 1 Cor. 15. Part 1: An Enquiry into the Jewish Background* (CB.NT 7:1; Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1974), has not appeared so far.

[3] H. Molitor, *Auferstehung*, pp. 16-22.

Paul's ideas concerning 'dying and rising with Christ', including the idea of 'rising with Christ in the eschaton,' were the object of research by R.C. Tannehill.[1] However, in contrast to Molitor, he argued that Paul did not develop these ideas from his view of baptism, but used baptism to symbolize these ideas. According to Tannehill, the origin of Paul's connection of the eschatological resurrection with that of Christ should be sought in his understanding of the cross as an 'eschatological and inclusive event.'[2] The cross reflects the defeat of the power of sin and flesh to which all people must die. The believers participate in this defeat by accepting Jesus' death on the cross through faith. The significance of dying with Christ is that the old sinful person dies through Jesus' death.[3] Rising with Christ, as it is symbolized in baptism, is the necessary reverse side of dying with Christ. A variation of this symbolic dying and rising with Christ is the idea that a Christian will rise with Christ in the eschaton.[4] Thus, according to Tannehill, the origin of the idea of the eschatological resurrection as a participation in Jesus' resurrection is to be found in the special nature of the event on the cross.

Both Molitor's and Tannehill's explanation of the origin of the idea of the eschatological resurrection as a participation in Jesus' resurrection fall short. At the most they set out how Paul views the eschatological resurrection with Christ; they do not explain how Paul or others before him formed this idea. Molitor regarded baptism as the origin of the idea of the eschatological resurrection as a participation in Jesus' resurrection, but he did not explain how Paul arrived at his views on baptism. Tannehill saw the origin of Paul's association of the eschatological resurrection with that of Jesus in his view of the cross, but he failed to explain how Paul came to view Jesus' death on the cross the way he does. This death on the cross was a scandalous death, and if Paul or others interpreted it as an 'eschatological and inclusive event' with saving effect, one should explain by means of analogies how this could come about.

Others looked beyond Paul's writings in order to find the origin of the idea that a Christian is united with Christ, especially in his death and resurrection. Most frequently scholars referred to the mystery re-

---

[1] R.C. Tannehill, *Dying and Rising with Christ. A Study in Pauline Theology* (BZNW 32; Berlin: A. Töpelmann, 1967).

[2] Tannehill hastens to make clear that although Jesus' death on the cross is an 'eschatological and inclusive event,' it does not mean that Christ had some 'special corporate or inclusive nature' (p. 123).

[3] R.C. Tannehill, *Dying and Rising*, pp. 123-126.

[4] R.C. Tannehill, *Dying and Rising*, p. 130.

ligions as the origin, whether directly or indirectly, of the idea of dying and rising with Christ, including the idea of the eschatological resurrection with Christ. An example of this relatively old view[1] can be found in the work of J. Becker.[2] Becker adopted the thesis that in Rom. 6:1-11, but also in 1 Cor. 15:20-28, Paul reacts to a pre-Pauline baptismal theology according to which Christians have already died and risen with Christ in baptism.[3] This pre-Pauline baptismal theology was influenced by the mystery religions in which one finds dying and rising gods as well as the idea that a person participates in the fate of the deity. Paul corrects this mystery-like view on dying and rising with Christ by stating that a resurrection with Christ will be an eschatological event. Thus, on the one hand, Paul's ideas of dying and rising with Christ, including the idea of the eschatological resurrection with Christ, are analogous to those found in the mystery religions, but, on the other hand, his ideas are essentially different because of the eschatological framework in which they function.[4]

In a thorough study A.J.M. Wedderburn refuted the thesis that the mystery religions directly influenced the Christian concept of baptism as a dying and rising with Christ.[5] These were his two main arguments: (a) in the mystery religions there is a different relationship between the deity and the initiate, not expressed in 'with' language; (b) in the mystery religions the salvation of the initiate is not seen as coming about in analogy with that of the deity. Nevertheless, Wedderburn admitted that there are some agreements; for instance, the fact that also in the mystery religions the initiate puts his hope on the power of the deity for now and hereafter. Furthermore, in the mystery religions the rite of initiation is also a ritual anticipation of the future. However, the mystery religions have arrived at these ideas in a different way.[6]

Wedderburn offered an alternative explanation for the origin of the idea of dying and rising with Christ in baptism, and thereby indirectly for that of the idea of an eschatological resurrection with Christ. He argued that the view that becoming a Christian is comparable with a change from death to life was a traditional Christian view and that such

---

[1] For a historical survey of this view see A.J.M. Wedderburn, *Baptism*, pp. 3-5.

[2] J. Becker, *Auferstehung der Toten im Urchristentum* (SBS 82; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1976).

[3] See the remarks on this assumed pre-Pauline view of baptism above.

[4] J. Becker, *Auferstehung*, pp. 55-65.

[5] A.J.M. Wedderburn, *Baptism and Resurrection. Studies in Pauline Theology against Its Graeco-Roman Background* (WUNT 44; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1987).

[6] A.J.M. Wedderburn, *Baptism*, pp. 357-358.

a figurative use of terms for death and life was not exceptional in Paul's days. Exceptional was the idea that this change from death to life was a participation in someone's death and resurrection in the past, namely that of Jesus. A Christian has died *with Christ* and it is this 'with Christ' language which is characteristic of Paul's ideas. The idea that a person has been with Jesus in his death and resurrection has its origin in the idea of the unity and solidarity between Jesus and his followers. In accordance with traditions from the ancient Near East, reflected in the Old Testament, but also present in the Graeco-Roman world, Jesus was seen as a 'representative figure' who formed a unity with his people.[1] Like Adam (Rom. 5:12-21; 1 Cor. 15:21-22, 45-49) and Abraham (Gal. 3:8-9), Christ was seen as 'a representative figure through whom God speaks and acts towards the human race.' 'The "with" language thus arises out of this idea of the solidarity of the race with its representative.'[2]

Wedderburn continued to argue that the idea of unity and solidarity between Christ and Christians may also be the origin of the eschatological 'with Christ' sayings, including those that concern the eschatological resurrection with Christ. 'Since one has been "with" (σύν) one's representative in his representative act ... it is only natural that one expects the full consequence of that participation to unfold in a life with him now and hereafter, and that life with him hereafter should also be, according to Jewish apocalyptic imagery, one in his fellowship (μετά).'[3] In other words, Wedderburn took the idea of the eschatological association with Christ, including the idea of the eschatological resurrection with Christ, to be a further development of the idea of 'dying with Christ' and, indirectly, of the idea of the unity and solidarity between Christ and the Christians. Following Dupont he admitted that there are some agreements between the eschatological 'with Christ' sayings and Jewish apocalyptic traditions about the eschatological association of the saviour and his followers. However, 'the idea of solidarity with a representative may be logically, and perhaps also chronologically, prior to the idea of eschatological communion.'[4]

Wedderburn's ideas about the unity and solidarity between Christ and Christians as the origin of Paul's 'with' and 'in' Christ language were not completely new. Earlier, E. Best had reached a similar con-

---

[1] A.J.M. Wedderburn, *Baptism*, pp. 348-351.

[2] A.J.M. Wedderburn, *Baptism*, p. 350; see also his article, 'Some Observations on Paul's Use of the Phrases "In Christ" and "With Christ"', *JSNT* 25 (1985), pp. 83-97.

[3] A.J.M. Wedderburn, *Baptism*, pp. 347-348, 357.

[4] A.J.M. Wedderburn, *Baptism*, p. 348.

clusion.[1] Best spoke of Jesus as having a 'corporate personality' and Christians as having 'racial solidarity' with Christ. In these concepts Best saw the origin of Paul's 'in Christ' and 'with Christ' language. However, as Wedderburn pointed out, the terms 'corporate personality' and 'racial solidarity' are vague and misleading.[2] Wedderburn's analysis of the origin of Paul's 'with' and 'in' Christ language is much more refined than Best's. Nevertheless, Paul's idea of 'being made alive again in Christ' (1 Cor. 15:22) was studied more closely by Best. Viewing Jesus as the ἀπαρχή means that he is the 'representative' and that there is a 'unity between the first-fruits and the rest of the crop.' Being made alive *in* Christ means that Christians are raised through (διά) Christ (v. 21), that is, they share in the resurrection of their representative.[3]

In this study the results of Best and Wedderburn regarding the origin of Paul's 'with' and 'in' Christ language will be followed. Yet there are still some unanswered questions. Wedderburn took the idea of rising with Christ in the eschaton to be the logical and chronological sequel to the idea of dying with Christ. However, is it not more likely that Paul applied the idea of unity and solidarity between Jesus and his followers directly to the concept of resurrection and not indirectly nor by analogy with his idea of dying with Christ? If so, how did Paul come to apply this idea of unity and solidarity between Jesus and Christians to the expectation of the eschatological resurrection?

(4) Traditio-historical analyses of the idea that the eschatological resurrection will take place at the time of Jesus' parousia are not lacking. However, most of these focused on the interpretation of 1 Thess. 4:13-18, leaving aside 1 Cor. 15:20-28. In 1 Thess. 4:16-17, just as in 1 Cor. 15:23, Paul speaks of the eschatological resurrection in close relationship with the theme of Jesus' coming on the last day. Since 1 Thess. 4:13-18 is the older passage of the two, all research regarding the origin of this idea has focused on 1 Thess. 4:13-18.

A reconstruction of the history of the traditions underlying the idea that the eschatological resurrection will coincide with Jesus' parousia is

---

[1] E. Best, *One Body in Christ, A Study in the Relationship of the Church to Christ in the Epistles of the Apostle Paul* (London: SPCK, 1955).

[2] A.J.M. Wedderburn, *Baptism*, pp. 352-356; he refers thereby, of course, to the important article of J.W. Rogerson, 'The Hebrew Conception of Corporate Personality: a Reexamination', *JThS* 21 n.s. (1970), pp. 1-16. Cf. J.R. Porter, 'The Legal Aspects of the Concept of "Corporate Personality" in the Old Testament', *VT* 15 (1965), pp. 361-380.

[3] E. Best, *Body*, pp. 38-39.

dependent on how one views the origin of each of the two expectations contained in this idea. By examining how and when the (Christian) expectation of the eschatological resurrection or that of Jesus' parousia arose, one is forced to form an idea as to how and when these two eschatological expectations came to be related to each other. Basically, scholars hold either of two positions. (a) A large group of scholars regard both expectations as belonging to Christianity from its very beginning, that is, from the time of Jesus' ministry on earth.[1] As a result, they assume that these two expectations were telescoped right from the beginning. (b) A smaller group of authors regard the expectation of the eschatological resurrection as a later phenomenon within Christianity, not existent until Paul wrote his letter to the Thessalonians.[2] Consequently, these scholars maintain that the expectation of the eschatological resurrection was added to earlier expectations regarding the eschaton including that of Jesus' second coming. Thus, there seems to be a consensus of opinion as to when the expectation of Jesus' parousia originated: it belonged to Christianity from its beginning. The debated issue, however, is at what time or moment within early Christianity the expectation of the eschatological resurrection arose. The debate centres around the interpretation of 1 Thess. 4:13-18.

The question whether or not Paul introduces the Thessalonians to a totally new subject in 1 Thess. 4:13-18, namely, the expectation of the eschatological resurrection, has been discussed more than once.[3] The arguments in favour of the view that Paul informs the Thessalonians of

---

[1] For instance, E. Grässer, *Das Problem der Parusieverzögerung in den synoptischen Evangelien und in der Apostelgeschichte* (BZNW 22; Berlin: A. Töpelmann, 1957), pp. 3-59; J. Baumgarten, *Apokalyptik*, p. 229; J. Becker, *Auferstehung*, pp. 14-17; C. Rowland, *Origins*, pp. 148-150.

[2] So, for instance, W. Marxsen, 'Auslegung von 1 Thess 4,13-18', *ZThK* 66 (1969), pp. 21-37, esp. 27-29; G. Lüdemann, *Paulus, der Heidenapostel. Band I. Studien zur Chronologie* (FRLANT 123; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1980), pp. 229-263; H.-H. Schade, *Christologie*, pp. 162-163, especially note 399 (p. 287) where he lists more adherents of this view; H.C.C. Cavallin, 'Parusi och uppståndelse. 1 Th. 4:13-18 som kombination av två slags eskatologi', *SvTK* 59 (1983), pp. 54-63. It is quite remarkable that this view is also endorsed by those scholars who explain the origin of the belief in Jesus' resurrection with the help of the traditional Jewish expectation of the eschatological resurrection; see, for instance, U. Wilckens, 'Ursprung', p. 143; G. Kegel, *Auferstehung*, p. 36; see also above, pp. 4-8 cf. H.-H. Schade, *Christologie*, pp. 164-166. These scholars do not seem to realize that by making the expectation of the eschatological resurrection a late phenomenon in Christianity, they take away the basis for their explanation of the origin of the belief in Jesus' resurrection as a belief in a proleptic eschatological resurrection. This must be due to the fact that in their opinion the appearances gave the resurrection of Jesus the status of an independent event.

[3] For a historical survey, see G. Lüdemann, *Paulus*, pp. 220-230.

something new, i.e., the view that the Thessalonians were unfamiliar with the idea of a resurrection at the end of time, can be summarized in three points.

First, judging from Paul's introduction in verses 13-14 he seems to introduce a new subject: οὐ θέλομεν δὲ ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν.[1] Furthermore, Paul interprets the grief of the Thessalonians over Christians who have passed away as a lack of hope comparable with a non-Christian view on life after death (v. 13). This would indicate that the Thessalonians were of the opinion that there would be no after-life for those who had died before the parousia, i.e., that they were unfamiliar with the idea of a resurrection at the end of time.[2]

Secondly, within Paul's exposition of the eschatological events in verses 16-17 the idea of a resurrection is not more than an 'auxiliary notion'.[3] All emphasis is on Jesus' coming from heaven, which is described as something glorious, whereas the resurrection is incorporated within this expectation as an additional phenomenon. Apparently, Paul himself did not reckon with a resurrection until being confronted with the deaths of certain Christians in Thessalonica. Subsequently, Paul's ideas about the end of time, until then completely dominated by Jesus' parousia, were expanded by including the expectation of the eschatological resurrection which he placed between Jesus' descent and the Christians' ascent.

Thirdly, it may be assumed that the earliest Christians in general anticipated Jesus' parousia so eagerly that they did not expect anyone to die in the meantime. Since Christianity was predominantly an eschatological movement all attention was focused on Jesus' coming. The deaths in the Thessalonian community therefore came as a surprise, not only to the Thessalonians and Paul, but also to all other Christians of those days.[4]

All three arguments have been encountered and rebutted with arguments leading to a different thesis; namely, that the issue was not the resurrection itself, but the relationship between the Christians living at the time of Jesus' parousia and those who had first to be raised.[5]

---

[1] G. Lüdemann, *Paulus*, pp. 232-233.

[2] W. Marxsen, 'Auslegung', pp. 26, 32; J. Becker, *Auferstehung*, pp. 47-48.

[3] W. Marxsen, 'Auslegung', p. 29; H.-H. Schade, *Christologie*, p. 163.

[4] H.-H. Schade, *Christologie*, p. 163; but cf. W. Harnisch, *Eschatologische Existenz. Ein exegetischer Beitrag zum Sachanliegen von 1. Thessalonicher 4,13-5,11* (FRLANT 110; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1973), pp. 21-22.

[5] So, for instance, H. Merklein, 'Der Theologe als Prophet. Zur Funktion prophetischen Redens im theologischen Diskurs des Paulus', *NTS* 38 (1992), pp. 402-429; see

If Paul introduces a topic unknown to the Thessalonians in verses 13-14,[1] namely, the expectation of the eschatological resurrection, his presentation of it remains rather vague. In verse 14, where he uses the belief in Jesus' death and resurrection as a point of comparison, Paul does not speak about a resurrection but about God leading the dead with and through Christ (ἄξει σὺν αὐτῷ).[2] Furthermore, the fact that Paul compares the grief of the Thessalonians with the desperate situation of non-Christians does not necessarily mean that, in Paul's view, the Thessalonians did not have any hope at all. Only if their hope does not include a proper view on the fate of the dead, is their hope not more than that of gentiles, according to Paul. The misunderstanding concerning the dead in the Thessalonian view on the eschatological events does not need to be taken as evidence that they were of the opinion that the dead would not be raised at all. It is just as well possible that, although believing that the dead would be raised, they underestimated the position of the dead in relation to the living at the end of time, and that this misconception was the actual cause of their grief.[3]

Secondly, the fact that the expectation of the eschatological resurrection is only an 'auxiliary notion' within Paul's view of the end of time in verses 16-17 can also indicate that the resurrection itself was not the issue. The relationship between Christians raised from the dead and Christians still alive at Jesus' parousia seems to be more important than the resurrection itself. Paul emphasizes with a 'word of the Lord' that the living will 'by no means precede' (οὐ μὴ φθάσωμεν) those Christians who have passed away; the dead will be raised first (πρῶτος) and then the dead and the living will meet the Lord in the air together (ἅμα σύν). From Paul's use of the phrases οὐ μὴ φθάσωμεν, πρῶτος, and ἅμα σύν, one may conclude that the point of Paul's concern was not the resurrection but the relationship between two categories of Christians.[4]

---

the adherents of this view listed in note 16 (p. 407); cf. G. Lüdemann, *Paulus*, pp. 226-227.

[1] The phrase οὐ θέλομεν δὲ ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν (v. 13) is a common introduction to a topic of importance; the phrase does not necessarily indicate that the topic is unknown to the readers; see Rom. 1:13; 11:25; 1 Cor. 10:1; 12:1; 2 Cor. 1:8; cf. T. Holtz, *Der erste Brief an die Thessalonicher* (EKK; Zürich: Benzinger Verlag, Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1986), p. 187.

[2] H. Merklein, 'Theologe', p. 405.

[3] P. Hoffmann, *Die Toten in Christus. Eine religionsgeschichtliche und exegetische Untersuchung zur paulinischen Eschatologie* (NTA 2 n.F.; Münster: Aschendorff, 1966), p. 211; H. Merklein, 'Theologe', p. 408.

[4] J. Gillmann, 'Signals of Transformation in 1 Thessalonians 4:13-18', *CBQ* 47 (1985), pp. 263-281, esp. 270-271; H. Merklein, 'Theologe', pp. 406-408.

Thirdly, in reaction to the view that the earliest Christians anticipated Jesus' parousia so eagerly that they did not expect any people to die in the meantime, it has been observed that as a former Pharisee Paul must have expected a resurrection at the end of time. On the basis of his Pharisaic background, it is argued that Paul's world-view must have contained the expectation of a resurrection at the end of time, since that was the view generally accepted among Pharisees.[1] Consequently, it is assumed that Paul must have already spoken about the future resurrection when he founded the Thessalonian community.[2]

It is difficult to decide whether 1 Thess. 4:13-18 intended to inform the Thessalonians for the first time about the future resurrection or to clarify the relationship between resurrected and still living Christians at the moment of Jesus' second coming. The arguments pro and contra seem to counterbalance each other. Nevertheless, the broader question, namely, whether or not the expectation of the eschatological resurrection developed within Christianity only secondarily, can be decided regardless of the solution to this problem. Although complete certainty cannot be attained, there are arguments which support the assumption that the expectation of the eschatological resurrection belonged to Christianity from its beginning.[3] (a) Paul's reference to a 'word of the Lord' (1 Thess. 4:15) shows that he knows and uses Christian tradition regarding the fate of the dead at Jesus' parousia.[4] (b) It is reasonable to assume that in the first two decades of the history of the Christian movement several Christians had died. These deaths are likely to have elicited speculation on the presence of the deceased Christians at Christ's second coming. (c) Since the tradition of the eschatological resurrection occurs in pre-Christian Jewish sources as well as in many early Christian sources, and the earliest Christians were all Jewish, it is reasonable to infer that the eschatological resurrection was a Christian tenet from the outset.

Not only the analysis of the origin of the expectation of the eschatological resurrection, but also that of the origin of the expectation of Jesus' parousia is of importance for the traditio-historical analysis of the idea that the eschatological resurrection will take place at the time of

---

[1] U. Luz, *Das Geschichtsverständnis des Paulus* (BEvTh 49; München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1968), p. 320; J. Becker, *Auferstehung*, p. 46.

[2] E. Best, *A Commentary on the First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians* (BNTC; London: A. & C. Black, 1972), p. 81.

[3] These arguments will be worked out in chapter V, pp. 87-94.

[4] The precise content and source of this 'word of the Lord' is unimportant here; for Paul it was tradition.

Jesus' parousia. Most scholars explain the origin of the hope for Jesus' parousia[1] by arguing that the earliest Christians believed that a glorious coming at the end of time was part of the functions which Jesus received when he was raised and exalted. Through his resurrection Jesus was exalted and enthroned as Lord, messiah, and Son of Man. In that capacity he was to come again with glory at the end of time.[2] This view was supported with examinations of the Christological titles attributed to Jesus.

F. Hahn,[3] for instance, argued that the expectation of Jesus' parousia originated from the recognition of Jesus as Son of Man and Lord (κύριος). After his death Jesus was identified as the coming Son of Man whom he had announced.[4] The historical Jesus had spoken about the coming Son of Man, thereby referring, however, to someone other than himself. Yet, after his death and resurrection, Jesus' followers concluded that the (risen) Jesus would be this coming Son of Man. Jesus' followers also expected him to return because they revered him as their Lord: μαράνα θά (1 Cor. 16:23; Did. 10:6), translated into Greek as ἔρχου κύριε (Rev. 22:20). This use of the term 'Lord', that is, as heavenly Lord, was an extension of the disciples' use of 'lord' (meaning 'sir' or 'teacher') for Jesus during his terrestrial ministry. Eventually, the title Lord came to refer to Jesus' former, terrestrial person, his glorious person in heaven, and his lordship at the moment of his second coming.[5] Thus, the expectation of Jesus' coming at the

---

[1] A. Oepke already demonstrated that the word παρουσία itself offers insufficient ground for explaining the origin of the belief in Jesus' coming at the end of time. For the coming of God's eschatological agent, the word is only used in Christian texts. The word is of pagan (Hellenistic) origin. It means either 'presence', of persons as well as of gods, or 'coming', in particular the visit of a ruler; A. Oepke, 'παρουσία', *ThWNT*, vol. V (1954), pp. 856-869; see also W. Radl, *Ankunft des Herrn. Zur Bedeutung und Funktion der Parusieaussagen bei Paulus* (BET 15; Frankfurt a. M./Bern/Cirencester [U.K.]: Peter D. Lang, 1981), pp. 177-181.

[2] J. Weiss, *Urchristentum*, pp. 20-25; E. Schweizer, *Erniedrigung*, p. 70; U. Wilckens, 'Ursprung', p. 90; W. Thüsing, *Erhöhungsvorstellung und Parusieerwartung in der ältesten nachösterlichen Christologie* (SBS 42; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1969), pp. 88-99; J. Becker, *Auferstehung*, pp. 15-17; W. Radl, *Ankunft*, pp. 192-195; see also the surveys of literature in A.L. Moore, *The Parousia in the New Testament* (NovT.S 13; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1966), pp. 35-91; L.J. Kreitzer, *Jesus and God in Paul's Eschatology* (JSNT.S 19; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987).

[3] F. Hahn, *Christologische Hoheitstitel. Ihre Geschichte im frühen Christentum* (FRLANT 83; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963, [3]1966).

[4] F. Hahn, *Hoheitstitel*, p. 41.

[5] F. Hahn, *Hoheitstitel*, p. 112. Later, Jesus was also called 'messiah'. With this term Christians referred to his activity at the end of time. Subsequently, the concept of the eschatological messiah fused with the concept of the coming Son of Man (p. 189).

end of time was part of the Christology which arose after Jesus' death and resurrection on the basis of Jewish traditions.[1]

The origin of the expectation of Jesus' parousia lies undeniably in Jewish traditions, specifically those concerning the Son of Man.[2] However, why these traditions were used remains an unanswered question. If Jesus was seen as the coming Son of Man it has to be clarified why he was seen as such. When Jesus spoke about the Son of man he referred to someone else, Hahn argued. However, he did not make it clear why, at some point, Jesus was identified as the coming Son of Man. The traditional view that his appointment to the position of Son of Man was part of his resurrection (exaltation) rests on an unacceptable confusion of motifs stemming from different traditions: resurrection and enthronement do not belong together.[3] Thus, the identification of Jesus with the coming Son of Man must have its origin somewhere else than in the concept of his resurrection.

Finding a satisfactory explanation for the identification of Jesus as the coming Son of Man is of great importance, for it would throw light at the same time on the question of *why* Jesus' followers expected him to return at the end of time. Most scholars have failed to see the importance of this question. However, if one assumes that Jesus himself did

---

[1] The explanation of Kramer, whose research of the christological titles focused on Paul's letters is not very different from Hahn's; W. Kramer, *Christos Kyrios Gottessohn. Untersuchungen zu Gebrauch und Bedeutung der christologischen Bezeichnungen bei Paulus und den vorpaulinischen Gemeinden* (AThANT 44; Zürich/Stuttgart: Zwingli, 1963). Kramer, too, held that the title of 'Lord' implied both the idea of an eschatological coming, derived from the tradition of the Son of Man although that title was not used (pp. 97-99), and the idea of Christ's presence in the cult (for instance in Phil. 2:6-11; pp. 79-80).

[2] The view according to which the tradition of the Son of Man forms the basis of the origin of the expectation of Jesus' parousia has become the standard one; see, for instance, W. Radl, *Ankunft*, pp. 187-189. How this tradition was used exactly, however, is debated. A point of disagreement is whether Jesus used the title Son of Man in reference to himself, in an indirect way, or to someone else. Others question the view that Jesus spoke about the coming Son of Man at all. For a survey of some of the literature on these issues, see G. Haufe, 'Das Menschensohn-Problem in der gegenwärtigen wissenschaftlichen Diskussion', *EvTh* 16 (1956), pp. 130-141; C. Colpe, 'Neue Untersuchungen zum Menschen-Sohn Problem', *ThRv* 77 (1981), pp. 353-372; W.O. Walker, 'The Son of Man: Some Recent Developments', *CBQ* 45 (1983), pp. 584-607; J.R. Donahue, 'Recent Studies on the Origin of "Son of Man" in the Gospels', *CBQ* 48 (1986), pp. 484-498; W.G. Kümmel, 'Der persönliche Anspruch sowie der Prozess und Kreuzestod Jesu', *ThR* 56 n.F. (1991), pp. 391-420. Another point of debate is what the tradition of the Son of Man looked like in first century Judaism; see, for instance, J.J. Collins, 'The Son of Man in First-Century Judaism', *NTS* 38 (1992), pp. 448-466.

[3] See above, pp. 8-9.

not announce his second coming at the end of time,[1] it must be explained why his followers at some point did come to embrace this expectation.

Among those who have tried to give an answer to this question is J.A.T. Robinson.[2] He argued that the expectation of a second coming, which in his view was a relatively late phenomenon within Christianity (1 Thessalonians), arose as a result of a 'crisis in Christology.' People started to doubt whether or not the messianic event had taken place. The solution was a compromise, according to Robinson: Christ had already come and yet would come.[3] Although this expectation did not originally belong to Jesus' message, Christians did find a basis for this belief in Jesus' preaching. Jesus described his future vindication and exaltation in terms of the vindication of the Son of Man in Dan. 7:13-14 (Mark 14:62). What originally was the Son of Man's ascent to God (Dan. 7:13) was transformed by his followers into his descent.[4]

Robinson's unconventional solution does not rest on solid grounds. First of all, the expectation of Jesus' parousia must be older than 1 Thessalonians since Paul speaks about it as a well-known topic.[5] Secondly, the earliest expectation of Jesus' coming as found in 1 Thessalonians does not show in any way that the belief in Jesus' coming was an answer to a Christological crisis. Nowhere in Paul's letters does one find traces of such a Christological crisis. Robinson seemed to be aware of this for that must be the reason why he turned to the synoptic gospels.[6] But even if his interpretation of the prediction of the vindication of Jesus in terms of the Son of Man is correct, the lack of evidence for a Christological crisis in Paul's letters makes his solution unacceptable.

---

[1] The view that Jesus himself did not speak about his return is well-founded. Firstly, Jesus' coming at the end of time is practically never spoken of as a 'return', but as a 'coming'. Secondly, it is inconceivable that Jesus spoke about his second coming at the end of time since, if he did, he must have expected his own vindication in heaven after a violent death. But there is no solid evidence that the historical Jesus expected to be vindicated after being put to death. Thirdly, none of the synoptic predictions of Jesus' death and resurrection contains a reference to his parousia; they cannot be traced back to Jesus anyhow. Cf. E. Grässer, *Parusieverzögerung*, p. 58.

[2] J.A.T. Robinson, *Jesus and His Coming. The Emergence of a Doctrine* (London: SCM, 1957).

[3] J.A.T. Robinson, *Coming*, p. 142.

[4] J.A.T. Robinson, *Coming*, pp. 44-45.

[5] J. Dupont, *L'union*, pp. 49-64; H.-H. Schade, *Christologie*, p. 27.

[6] J.A.T. Robinson, *Coming*, p. 118.

T.F. Glasson[1] explained the emergence of the expectation of Jesus' coming by arguing that the coming of Jesus as described in the New Testament, i.e., Jesus' coming from heaven on the clouds with the sound of the trumpet, shows no points of agreement with the advent of any other eschatological agent in Jewish literature. Rather, Jesus' coming resembles the coming of God at the end of time as described in Old Testament prophecies. These prophecies were applied to Jesus because he 'spoke of a return of some kind,' perhaps in terms of a vindication, but he did not openly speak about his return.[2]

Glasson's explanation fails to account for the 'vague' way in which Jesus announced his coming. Furthermore, Glasson dismissed all extra-biblical evidence with regard to coming eschatological agents. Instead, he turned to the Old Testament prophecies about the coming of God and argued that these prophecies were directly used for the belief in Jesus' coming at the end of time. It has been demonstrated more than once, however, that the description of Jesus' parousia agrees more with those of the comings of eschatological agents in extra-biblical literature than with the descriptions of God's coming in the Old Testament.[3]

Recently, H.J. de Jonge proposed another explanation for the emergence of the belief in Jesus' second coming.[4] In De Jonge's view, a number of those who followed Jesus during his terrestrial ministry believed that Jesus would be the central figure in this kingdom. After Jesus' death his followers held on to this conviction, even though the one who had announced and inaugurated this kingdom had died. However, instead of expecting that this kingdom would be established with Jesus as messiah, they believed that this would be done by Jesus descending from heaven as the Son of Man. They had shared the belief in the coming of the Son of Man with Jesus. For Jesus himself had spoken about the coming Son of Man at the end of time, although referring thereby to someone else. After Jesus' death, his followers identified him as the coming Son of Man, for in this way they could maintain Jesus' eschatological message. Thus, the concept of Jesus' parousia, that

---

[1] T.F. Glasson, 'Theophany and Parousia', *NTS* 34 (1988), pp. 259-270; the article is a sequel to his book, *The Second Advent. The Origin of the New Testament Doctrine* (London: Epworth, 1945, ²1947).

[2] T.F. Glasson, 'Theophany', pp. 266-267.

[3] See especially L.J. Kreitzer, *Eschatology, passim.*

[4] H.J. de Jonge, 'De oorsprong van de verwachting van Jezus' wederkomst', in: H.J. de Jonge, W.B.J. de Ruyter (eds.), *Totdat hij komt. Een discussie over de wederkomst van Jezus Christus* (Baarn: Ten Have, 1995), pp. 9-36.

is, his coming as Son of Man, was an auxiliary notion which arose as a result of the wish to maintain Jesus' eschatological message.[1]

De Jonge's explanation of the origin of the belief in Jesus' parousia makes this belief a product of the time after Jesus' death although not long after his death. For the traditio-historical analysis of the idea that the eschatological resurrection will take place at the time of Jesus' parousia, this conclusion is of great importance. The expectation of the eschatological resurrection is likely to have belonged to Christianity from its beginning. If De Jonge is right, the belief in Jesus' second coming emerged very soon after he died. If so, the two expectations must have coalesced soon after Easter. This study will offer further support for this view.

[1] H.J. de Jonge, 'Wederkomst', pp. 27-28.

PART ONE

PAUL'S EXPOSITION OF THE ESCHATOLOGICAL RESURRECTION IN 1 CORINTHIANS 15

Part one of this study will offer an analysis of Paul's exposition of the eschatological resurrection in 1 Corinthians 15, especially of the three ideas under investigation (vv. 20-23). First, in chapter I, two introductory problems will be discussed: why did some of the Corinthians reject a resurrection of the dead and how does Paul oppose this opinion in favour of his own view? Then, in chapter II, the relationship between the belief in Jesus' resurrection and the expectation of the eschatological resurrection will be analysed (vv. 20-23). Central to this analysis will be the notion of Jesus' resurrection as the beginning of the eschatological resurrection and the idea that the eschatological resurrection will take place through participation in Jesus' resurrection. In the last chapter, chapter III, the relationship between the eschatological resurrection and Jesus' parousia will be examined (v. 23), in particular the idea that the resurrection will take place at the time of Jesus' parousia.

I. INTRODUCTORY PROBLEMS

Any examination of Paul's exposition of the eschatological resurrection in 1 Corinthians 15 needs to be prefaced by a discussion of two preliminary issues. Firstly, one should try to discern the ideas and convictions underlying the Corinthian denial of the future resurrection (section a). What was the reason for some of the Corinthians to reject the belief that there will be a resurrection at the end of time? Secondly, Paul's argumentation should be analysed (section b). In what way does Paul try to refute the Corinthian point of view and convince them of his own point of view? Only when it is clear *why* the Corinthians denied the eschatological resurrection and *how* Paul opposes this opinion can the three ideas under investigation in this study be effectively examined.

a. *The denial of the resurrection*

(1) In order to reconstruct the grounds on which some of the Corinthians came to deny 'a resurrection of the dead' (1 Cor. 15:12), one has no other evidence, unfortunately, than Paul's reply to this denial. A further difficulty is that this reply seems to offer rather varied and sometimes even contradictory information. Recovering the basis of the Corinthian denial is therefore a major problem.

The various solutions which have been proposed in the course of time can be categorized in the following way.[1]

(a) The Corinthians denied a resurrection of the dead because they did not believe in life after death.

---

[1] For a review of the various solutions together with all the arguments and their adherents, see G. Sellin, *Der Streit um die Auferstehung der Toten. Eine religionsgeschichtliche und exegetische Untersuchung von 1 Korinther 15* (FRLANT 138; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986), pp. 17-37; see also B. Spörlein, *Die Leugnung der Auferstehung. Eine historisch-kritische Untersuchung zu 1 Kor 15* (BU 7; Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet Regensburg, 1971), pp. 2-16; A.J.M. Wedderburn, *Baptism*, pp. 6-15; G. Barth, 'Zur Frage nach der in 1 Korinther 15 bekämpften Auferstehungsleugnung', *ZNW* 83 (1992), pp. 187-201, esp. 187-191; C.M. Tuckett, '"How can some of you say there is no resurrection of the dead?" (1 Cor. 15:12)', in: R. Bieringer (ed.), *The Corinthian Correspondence* (BEThL; Leuven: University Press/Peeters, forthcoming).

(b) The Corinthians denied a resurrection of the dead because they believed that the resurrection had already happened (cf. 2 Tim. 2:18); this belief was either influenced by Gnostic ideas, by ideas which can be found in the mystery religions, or by a baptismal theology.
(c) The Corinthians denied a resurrection of the dead because they could not accept the bodily character of such a form of after-life.
(d) Paul misunderstood the Corinthians.

The view that the Corinthians denied every form of after-life (a) is based on verses 17-19 and 32-34, where Paul seems to argue against such an opinion. However, the decisive argument against this view is verse 29 which presupposes, despite many accompanying difficulties, that Paul ascribes at least some kind of belief in after-life to the Corinthians.

Because of the alleged contradiction between verses 17-19 and 22-34, on the one hand, and verse 29, on the other, many scholars have suggested that Paul misunderstood or was misinformed about the Corinthians' position (d). Yet, these scholars eventually indicated one of the other positions (a, b, or c) as the actual Corinthian view. Consequently, they regarded the passages which do not match the position ascribed to the Corinthians as the effect of Paul's misinterpretation of, or misinformation about, the Corinthian situation.[1] But if one supposes that Paul misrepresents the Corinthian opinion it becomes impossible to know the Corinthian point of view at all.[2]

The view that the resurrection was denied because the Corinthians believed that the resurrection had already taken place (b) was originally advocated by many scholars, but it has received severe criticism in the course of time.[3] In any case there is not enough evidence in 1 Corinthians 15 or the rest of the letter to support the view that the Corinthians believed that the resurrection had already taken place.[4] Furthermore, the comparison of the ideas on which this Corinthian conviction is thought to be based with the soteriology of Gnosticism

---

[1] G. Sellin, *Streit*, p. 20.

[2] G. Sellin, *Streit*, p. 20; C.M. Tuckett, 'Resurrection', forthcoming.

[3] For a review of the history of this 'realized eschatology' view, as it is called sometimes, see D.W. Kuck, *Judgment and Community Conflict. Paul's Use of Apocalyptic Judgment Language in 1 Corinthians 3:5-4:5* (NovT.S 66; Leiden/New York/København/Köln: E.J. Brill, 1992), pp. 16-25.

[4] For an overview of the arguments adduced in the course of time, see D.W. Kuck, *Judgment*, pp. 27-31.

and the mystery religions turns out to yield more differences than agreements.[1]

(2) The thesis that the Corinthians denied a resurrection of the dead since they had difficulty in accepting the bodily character of such a resurrection (c) has been argued most extensively by G. Sellin. His analysis of the Corinthian denial is based above all on Paul's elaborate explanation of the nature of the resurrection body in verses 35-49. Sellin examined in particular the language of verses 45-49 (πνεῦμα ζῳοποιοῦν, the Adam-Christ antithesis, ψυχικός versus πνευματικός) with which Paul tries to take away the Corinthian objections against a resurrection body.[2] Paul adopts these concepts from the objections made by the Corinthian community. There they were part of a 'dualistic anthropology', which had its origin in Hellenistic Wisdom traditions, as represented, for instance, by Philo. According to this dualistic anthropology, there are two different classes of people: non-spiritual and spiritual.[3] Spiritual people are those whose soul is 'inspired' by the transcendental spirit (πνεῦμα). As a result of this inspiration, the person who is inspired transcends all bodily matters. The body is nothing more than the vessel in which the immortal soul dwells. Eventually, the body will be left behind. Dying, according to this dualistic view, is simply the final separation of the spiritualized soul from the body; it is the transition into a purely spiritual existence. In this view on life after death, Sellin concludes, a resurrection is not only impossible since it concerns the body, it is also unnecessary because immortality is reached by receiving the spirit.[4]

In response to the Corinthian view on after-life Paul presents his more Jewish, apocalyptic view on life after death, a view governed by the idea of a resurrection at the end of time.[5] For his discussion of the bodily character of the eschatological resurrection Paul tries to make use of the Corinthian ideas and concepts as much as possible. The ontological antithesis between non-spiritualized and spiritualized people is

---

[1] G. Sellin, *Streit*, pp. 23-30; A.J.M. Wedderburn, *Baptism, passim.*

[2] G. Sellin, *Streit*, pp. 79-189.

[3] Central to this differentiation of people was a specific interpretation of the 'inspired' Adam in Gen. 2:7.

[4] The main difference between the Corinthian view and the traditional Platonic dualism of body and soul was the idea of spiritualization, a notion meeting a certain need of soteriology; cf. G. Sellin, *Streit*, pp. 30-31.

[5] Although one cannot maintain that the expectation of a resurrection at the end of time was the common Jewish view in the first century C.E., this expectation is distinctively Jewish; cf. chapter V, pp. 85-87.

replaced by a chronological antithesis, and the order reversed: first the non-spiritual and then, after death, the spiritual form of existence.[1] Paul explains that there is a discontinuity between these two forms of life; a discontinuity which can only be bridged by resurrection. Resurrection will therefore be another act of creation, this time resulting in a spiritualized body. Paul's seemingly self-contradictory concept of a spiritualized body (σῶμα πνευματικόν) can be seen as the ultimate compromise between Paul's view and that of the Corinthians.

(3) Not only verses 35-49, but also other parts of Paul's exposition of the eschatological resurrection support Sellin's view that the Corinthians denied the resurrection at the end of time because of their 'dualistic anthropology'. If the Corinthians believed that death was nothing more than the transition of the (spiritualized) soul into a purely spiritual existence, it is understandable why Paul emphasizes the character and eventual destruction of death (vv. 21-22, 24-26). Paul sets out that death is a cosmic power, an enemy which came into the world through Adam and which will not be defeated until Christ appears at the end of time (v. 26). Only then can immortality and imperishability be 'put on' (vv. 54-55). In reaction to the Corinthian view, Paul presents a more Jewish, apocalyptic outlook.[2] Death, which the Corinthians believed would be passed by without difficulty on the journey to spiritual immortality, must be destroyed supernaturally at the end of time.

Paul stresses the future character of the resurrection, for instance, by connecting the eschatological resurrection to Jesus' parousia (v. 23). This emphasis, too, is best explained by supposing that the Corinthians held that salvation could be attained by passing from this life to a blissful life directly after death. Resurrection, Paul's alternative for the Corinthian view on life after death, is not only bodily, it is also eschatological; it will take place at the end of time. Paul counters the Corinthian view that the soul moves into spiritual immortality as soon as a person dies by stressing the fact that the resurrection will only take place at the end of time. One of the ways in which he accentuates the future character of the resurrection is by connecting the eschatological

---

[1] G. Sellin, *Streit*, p. 291.

[2] The idea of death as a cosmic enemy, present since the time of Adam and inescapable, is a traditional Jewish idea; see M.C. de Boer, *The Defeat of Death. Apocalyptic Eschatology in 1 Corinthians 15 and Romans 5* (JSNT.S 22; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1988), pp. 132-238; see also chapter II, pp. 55-56 and chapter III, p. 65.

resurrection to Jesus' parousia. In this way the resurrection is placed in an eschatological framework.[1]

(4) The denial of the eschatological resurrection by some of the Corinthians was only one result of their 'dualistic anthropology'. Throughout 1 Corinthians one finds passages containing traces of this ideology which Paul tries to set right. It is unclear, however, whether in all these passages he addresses the same group of people. The 'some' (τινές) whom Paul addresses may very well be a particular group of those who shared this anthropology.[2] In any case, the Corinthian ideology which led some of the Corinthians to deny the future resurrection of the dead, is perfectly in line with the Corinthian overestimation of the spiritualized soul and the accompanying contempt of the body which Paul attempts to correct time and again. In 2:10-3:9 Paul challenges the Corinthian claim of being spiritual people (πνευματικοί) by stating that they are mere people of the flesh (σάρκινοι), not more than babes (νήπιοι) still far away from being adults (τέλειοι). They may claim to have obtained the Spirit, but they live like people of the flesh since there is 'jealousy and quarreling' among them just like among other people (3:3).[3] The habit of fornication of some of them (6:12-20) and the liberty of others to eat food offered to idols (8:1-13) are based on the same undervaluation of the body and overestimation of the soul. They hold the opinion that 'all things are permitted' to them, especially with respect to the body, since they have transcended

---

[1] Sellin is reluctant to admit that Paul emphasizes the future character of the resurrection. According to Sellin, the connection of the resurrection to Jesus' parousia as well as other references to the future in these verses, for example, the future tenses, are only natural consequences of the concept of the eschatological resurrection; G. Sellin, *Streit*, pp. 270-275. The reason why Sellin is so reserved is that the references to the future in these verses are often used as arguments in favour of the view that the Corinthian opinion which Paul is opposing is the notion that the resurrection had already taken place (see above, option b). However, it is quite understandable that Paul's response to the Corinthian dualism would also comprise an emphasis on the future character of the eschatological resurrection. The Corinthians believed that a person's soul would live on immediately after death, whereas Paul's alternative is a future immortality, reached through a resurrection at the end of time.

[2] It is even impossible to know whether τινές in this case (1 Cor. 15:12) and in several other cases (e.g., 1 Cor. 4:18; 15:34) refers to many, a few, or only one or two members of the Corinthian church.

[3] For a further examination of the Corinthian ideas on 'spirituality', see R.A. Horsley, 'Pneumatikos vs. Psychikos. Distinctions of Spiritual Status among the Corinthians', *HThR* 69 (1976), pp. 268-288; R.A. Horsley, '"How can some of you say there is no resurrection of the dead?" Spiritual Elitism in Corinth', *NovT* 20 (1978), pp. 203-231.

bodily matters.[1] Only spiritual matters are of importance; thus, they strive above all for spiritual gifts, in particular speaking in tongues, even if it causes disorder in the community (14:1-40). Paul rejects such an easy liberalism and argues that all behaviour must be determined by love. Only through love can the community be built up.

(5) In summation, the denial of a 'resurrection of the dead' by some of the Corinthians was based on a 'dualistic anthropology'. Thinking in terms of this anthropology, the Corinthians believed that after death, the spiritualized soul would leave its bodily vessel and move into a purely spiritual and immortal existence. A resurrection was therefore impossible and unnecessary. Paul wants to refute this view of life after death and offers an alternative: a bodily resurrection at the end of time. Paul tries to dispel the main Corinthian objection to such a view, its bodily character, with terms taken from the dualistic anthropology prevalent among the Corinthian Christians. Furthermore, he sets out that death is a cosmic power which can only be overcome by Jesus at the end of time and he emphasizes that resurrection, life after death, is received at the end of time. Of main importance in his accentuation of the futurity of the resurrection is the connection of the eschatological resurrection to Jesus' parousia.

b. *Structure and argumentation*

(1) Paul's discussion of the eschatological resurrection in 1 Corinthians 15 can be divided into two parts: verses 1-34, in which Paul argues that there will be an eschatological resurrection, and verses 35-58, in which he goes into the bodily character of the eschatological resurrection. It may seem as if the second part (vv. 35-58, esp. 35-49) is the more important part of Paul's exposition since he tries in this section to remove the major Corinthian objection to a resurrection at the end of time. Yet, the first part (vv. 1-34) is equally important. Instead of expecting a resurrection at the end of time, the Corinthians had a view of life af-

[1] On the Corinthian ideas concerning liberty, see F.S. Jones, *'Freiheit' in den Briefen des Apostels Paulus. Eine historische, exegetische und religionsgeschichtliche Studie* (GTA 34; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1987), pp. 27-69; S. Vollenweider, *Freiheit als neue Schöpfung. Eine Untersuchung zur Eleutheria bei Paulus und in seiner Umwelt* (FRLANT 147; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989), pp. 199-246; A.J. Malherbe, 'Determinism and Free Will in Paul: The Argument of 1 Corinthians 8 and 9', in: T. Engberg-Pedersen (ed.), *Paul in his Hellenistic Context* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1994), pp. 231-255.

ter death which did not imply the expectation of the eschatological resurrection. Therefore, Paul shows first that there will be a resurrection at the end of time, then he tries to dispel the Corinthian objection to its bodily character.

The arguments which Paul utilizes to try to convince the Corinthians that there will be a resurrection at the end of time can be divided into two categories: arguments based on the belief in Jesus' resurrection (vv. 12-23) and arguments *ad hominem* (vv. 29-34).[1]

The arguments based on the belief in Jesus' resurrection are two in number. First, in verses 12-19, Paul sets up a quasi-logical argumentation in which he defends the future reality of the eschatological resurrection on the basis of the belief in Jesus' resurrection. Next, in verses 20-23, Paul articulates this quasi-logical relationship between the two resurrections in two concrete ideas: Jesus' resurrection is the beginning of the eschatological resurrection; people will be made alive through participation in Jesus' resurrection.

The arguments *ad hominem*, i.e., arguments which are not focused on the debated issue but on the participants in the debate, are also two in number: those which concern the Corinthian Christians (vv. 29, 33-34) and those based on Paul's personal life (vv. 30-32).

(2) Paul's argumentation in verses 12-19 may be called quasi-logical because, although some formal logical method of reasoning seems to underlie his argumentation,[2] the rhetorical elements clearly dominate.[3] Whether one recognizes in Paul's reasoning an *argumentum ad absurdum*[4] or the rule known as *modus tollendo tollens*,[5] it is the accompa-

---

[1] Perhaps Paul's treatment of the character and eventual destruction of death as well as his discussion of the future (eschatological) character of the resurrection (vv. 24-28) can be classified as a third set of (additional) arguments.

[2] For a survey of the various ways scholars have identified the logic in these verses, see T.G. Bucher, 'Die logische Argumentation in 1. Korinther 15,12-20', *Bib* 55 (1974), pp. 465-486, esp. 467-469.

[3] M. Bünker, *Briefformular und rhetorische Disposition im 1. Korintherbrief* (GTA 28; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984), p. 68.

[4] An *argumentum ad absurdum* functions as follows. A general statement cannot be maintained once an exception is found. Or, when denying statements are involved: a generally accepted negative thesis cannot be maintained if one positive exception is found. Applied to Paul's argumentation: the denial of the resurrection of the dead is invalid because of the established fact that Jesus has been raised. See, for example, J. Weiss, *Korintherbrief*, p. 353; M. Bünker, *Briefformular*, p. 68.

[5] The *modus tollendo tollens* is the mode which by denying denies. That is, the denial of the consequent leads to the denial of the antecedent. Applied to the premise of verse 13: the denial of the statement that 'Christ has not been raised' (v. 13b), entails the denial of the statement that 'there is no resurrection of the dead' (v. 13a). Thus, because

nying rhetoric which outweighs the logic. The basis of Paul's argumentation is the thesis or premise stated in verse 13: 'if there is no resurrection of the dead, then Christ has not been raised.' This premise is embedded in rhetoric. By showing the consequences of not accepting this premise Paul tries to force the premise upon the Corinthians. The denial of the premise would mean that Paul's message is false (vv. 14, 15); that the faith of the Corinthians is empty and ineffective (vv. 14, 17); moreover, that there is no hope at all of life after death (vv. 18-19). These consequences are not related to the premise in any formal, logical way; they simply appeal to the common sense of the Corinthian Christians.

The premise stated in verse 13, which is the basis of Paul's argumentation in verses 12-19, is carefully prepared in the preceding verses. In verses 1-11 Paul demonstrates the inevitable reality of Jesus' resurrection, the subject of the second part of the premise. Jesus' resurrection is attested by numerous persons who are said to have witnessed his appearances (vv. 5-7). Furthermore, Paul explains, Jesus' resurrection has been the content of the message of all the apostles, including himself (v. 11), and the Corinthian Christian community has accepted the message of Jesus' resurrection from the very beginning (vv. 1-3). On the basis of Jesus' resurrection Paul tries to demonstrate that the expectation of the eschatological resurrection is justified. He does this by setting up the thesis that the denial of the eschatological resurrection cannot be maintained if one accepts the resurrection of Jesus (v. 13). Or, without the negations, the belief in Jesus' resurrection must entail the expectation of the eschatological resurrection. Because it has been generally accepted, also by the Corinthians, that Jesus has been raised (vv. 1-11), the denial of the eschatological resurrection is to be abandoned, according to Paul.

Although Paul does not explicitly state in verse 13 that the resurrection connected to Jesus' resurrection (ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν) is the resurrection at the end of time, it is abundantly clear from Paul's whole argumentation that he is speaking about the future, eschatological resur-

---

Jesus has been raised (vv. 1-11, 20) the statement that 'there is no resurrection of the dead' is refuted; see T.G. Bucher, 'Argumentation', pp. 470-471. Bucher's article led to a heated debate, especially with M. Bachmann, who forced Bucher to defend his point of view time and again; see the literature listed in G.D. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (NIC; Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm.B. Eerdmans, 1987), p. 740. The debate has continued up to the present, see the article of C. Zimmer, 'Das argumentum resurrectionis 1 Kor. 15,12-20', *LingBibl* 65 (1991), pp. 25-36, and the follow-up, a.o. a reaction of Bachmann, in the following issues of *Linguistica Biblica.*

rection. Some authors have argued that the phrase ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν (v. 13) refers to resurrection in general, i.e., the possibility or category of resurrection.[1] According to these scholars, Paul first deduces the existence of the category of resurrection from the belief in Jesus' resurrection (v. 13), next he turns to the eschatological resurrection (v. 23). However, if Paul's argumentation comprises indeed these three steps (Jesus' resurrection, resurrection in general, the eschatological resurrection), he should have stated, at some point, that if one accepts that there is resurrection in general, one should also accept that there will be a resurrection at the end of time. Because Paul does not make such a statement, one may safely assume that he is speaking about the eschatological resurrection all along, including verse 13 with the phrase ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν.

The thesis in verse 13, in which Paul connects the eschatological resurrection and Jesus' resurrection, is a conceptual construction, only meant to serve Paul's argumentation. The thesis is not true or false by itself;[2] it is nothing more than an assumption according to which the eschatological resurrection is the effect of Jesus' resurrection. Furthermore, the relationship posited between the two resurrections does not mean that they are of the same kind, as for instance Wilckens would have it.[3] The very fact that Paul puts so much effort into connecting the two shows that the resurrections were not originally related. It is not at all surprising, therefore, that the Corinthians could believe in Jesus' resurrection but not in the resurrection at the end of time.[4] The two are different events, stemming from different traditions,[5] and it is Paul who connects the two with the intention of con-

---

[1] See, for instance, M. Bachmann, 'Zum "argumentum resurrectionis" von 1 Kor. 15,12ff nach Christoph Zimmer, Augustin und Paulus', *LingBibl* 67 (1992), pp. 29-39.

[2] It has been argued that the thesis (v. 13) is true since it is structured according to the rules of a formal, logical way of reasoning; see, for instance, M. Bachmann, 'Rezeption von 1. Kor 15 (V. 12ff.) unter logischem und unter philologischem Aspekt', *LingBibl* 51 (1982), pp. 79-103, esp. 86-87. However, a logical way of reasoning cannot lead to a pronouncement as to whether an assertion is true or false; all it is concerned with are relationships between theses or assertions; see T.G. Bucher, 'Überlegungen zur Logik im Zusammenhang mit 1 Kor 15,12-20', *LingBibl* 53 (1983), pp. 70-98, esp. 84-85; C. Zimmer, 'Argumentum', *passim*.

[3] According to Wilckens the two resurrections are intrinsically connected since denying the one leads to denying the other; U. Wilckens, 'Ursprung', pp. 61-62. See also the section on the history of research into the development of the belief in Jesus' resurrection, pp. 6-7.

[4] Cf. C.M. Tuckett, 'Resurrection', forthcoming.

[5] See chapter IX, pp. 139-157.

vincing the Corinthians that there will be a resurrection at the end of time.

Since the thesis in verse 13 is no more than a hypothesis, Paul cannot stop after his quasi-logical 'proof' of the future reality of the eschatological resurrection (vv. 12-19). He continues in verses 20-23 by representing the relationship between the two resurrections in two ideas; these two ideas give substance to the thesis of verse 13. (a) Jesus has been raised as the first-fruits of those who have fallen asleep; that is, Jesus' resurrection is the beginning of the eschatological resurrection (vv. 20, 23). (b) People will be made alive in Christ; that is, the eschatological resurrection will take place through participation in Jesus' resurrection (vv. 21-22). These ideas are the embodiment of the quasi-logical thesis of verse 13 on the connection between the two resurrections. They explain in a concrete way Paul's view that the resurrection of Jesus leads indeed to the eschatological resurrection. In the former idea (a), Paul posits that there is a chronological order between the two resurrections, which means that the eschatological resurrection is the necessary sequel to Jesus' resurrection. With the latter idea (b), Paul stresses that the resurrection of Christians is part of Jesus' resurrection; the eschatological resurrection is incorporated in Jesus' resurrection. Therefore, if one believes that Jesus has been raised, one must also believe that there will be a resurrection at the end of time.

(3) The quasi-logical argumentation in verses 12-19 and the two ideas found in verses 20-23 have to be seen as interrelated. Moreover, the whole section of verses 1-23 should be seen as leading up to the fundamental ideas expressed in verses 20-23. That the ideas in verses 20-23 form indeed the climax of the whole section is apparent from the fact that Paul anticipates these ideas in the preceding verses (vv. 1-19). The two ideas of verses 20-23 are already prepared in the preceding verses in two ways.

First, the use of the perfect tense of ἐγείρεσθαι (ἐγήγερται; vv. 4, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 20) in its classical sense, meaning that an event in the past has its effect in the situation of the present, reflects Paul's idea that Jesus' resurrection is the new situation which, by necessity, must come to its completion in the eschatological resurrection. The use of the perfect tense is quite remarkable. Its use in a death and resurrection formula (v. 3) is without parallel.[1] The only time this perfect occurs in

[1] See 1 Thess. 4:14; 2 Cor. 5:15; Rom. 4:25; 8:34; 14:9. The perfect tense is also never used in the simple resurrection formula; see 1 Thess. 1:10; Gal. 1:1; 1 Cor. 6:14; 2

that formula, it is surrounded by three aorists (1 Cor. 15:3-4). Furthermore, in verse 15 Paul twice uses the aorist (ἤγειρεν) which contrasts with the five perfects in the rest of the pericope. Some scholars regard the perfect ἐγήγερται as a so-called post-classical perfect, i.e., a perfect which has lost its classical meaning and which functions as an aorist.[1] The use of the perfect with the function of an aorist, however, did not come into full practice until the second century C.E.[2] There are only a few examples of such a use of the perfect in the New Testament, and ἐγήγερται in 1 Corinthians 15 is certainly not one of these.[3]

The use of the perfect ἐγήγερται in its classical sense fits perfectly into Paul's argumentation. It 'sets forth with the utmost possible emphasis the abiding results of the event, which supply the main thought of the whole passage.'[4] The result of Jesus' resurrection in the past, then, is the coming of the eschatological resurrection. In other words, by using the perfect tense of ἐγείρεσθαι Paul already anticipates his idea that the eschatological resurrection will take place because of and through Jesus' resurrection.[5]

Second, the thought expressed in verse 18 anticipates Paul's ideas in verses 20-23, too. Denying a resurrection of the dead leads to the denial of the resurrection of Jesus, Paul repeats in verse 16, and 'if Christ has not been raised ... then also those who have died in Christ have perished' (vv. 17-18). The consequence worded in verse 18 starts with the consecutive coordinating conjunction ἄρα and is connected with the

---

Cor. 4:14; Rom. 4:24; 6:4, 9; 7:4; 8:11 (twice); 10:9; Col. 2:12; Eph. 1:20; 1 Pet. 1:21; Acts 13:37; the only exception is 2 Tim. 2:8. Cf. chapter IX, pp. 140-142.

[1] J. de Zwaan, *Syntaxis der wijzen en tijden in het Grieksche Nieuwe Testament* (a Dutch revision of E.W. Burton, *Syntax of New Testament Moods and Tenses*; Haarlem: H.D. Tjeenk Willink, 1906), pp. 54, 69.

[2] K.L. McKay, 'The Use of the Ancient Greek Perfect down to the Second Century A.D.', *BICS* 12 (1965), pp. 1-21.

[3] McKay rejects almost all instances brought forward by De Zwaan and by P. Chantraine in his *Histoire du parfait grec* (Collection Linguistique publiée par la Société de Linguistique de Paris 21; Paris: Librairie ancienne H. Champion, 1927), pp. 241-243; the latter did not regard ἐγήγερται as a post-classical perfect. Cf. BDR 342, 343.

[4] J.H. Moulton, N. Turner, W. Howard, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, ³1919), vol. I, p. 137. See also K.L. McKay, 'Perfect', pp. 12-13; J. Kremer, *Zeugnis*, p. 44.

[5] The two aorists in verse 15 are employed by Paul to explain what his message would have been if Christ had not been raised. In order to convey this message an aorist had to be used, a so-called constative aorist; J.H. Moulton et alii, *Grammar*, vol. I, p. 130. Paul not only switches from the perfect to the aorist, but he also switches from the passive to the active gender, thereby emphasizing that with this message he would witness against God, for God would not have raised Christ.

antecedent starting with εἰ in verse 17a.[1] The idea which Paul brings forward in this way, namely, that if it is denied that Christ has not been raised, the dead 'in Christ' have perished,[2] is the direct opposite of the idea that the dead will be made alive 'in Christ' (vv. 21-22). Christians will be raised in and through Jesus' resurrection (vv. 21-22). Thus, if Christ has not been raised then there will be no resurrection of Christians either (v. 18).

(4) Once Paul has 'proven' on the basis of Jesus' resurrection that there will be an eschatological resurrection (vv. 1-23), the apostle continues by describing the eschatological framework in which the eschatological resurrection is embedded. First, he connects the resurrection to Jesus' parousia, indicating thereby that the resurrection will not happen before the end of time (v. 23). Then Paul describes 'the end', the events which will take place when Jesus comes: he will destroy all enemies, of which death is the last, and hand over the kingdom to God[3] so that God will be everything in all (vv. 24-28).

It was already argued above (section a) that Paul connects the eschatological resurrection to Jesus' glorious coming and subsequent victory over death in order to show why the Corinthian view on life after death is wrong and why Paul's own alternative, an eschatological resurrection, is correct. Thus, the mention of some of Jesus' actions at his coming is not an unnecessary digression; it serves and sustains Paul's argumentation against the Corinthian understanding of life after death.[4]

---

[1] Εἰ ... ἄρα is a fixed combination; see, for instance, 1 Cor. 15:14; Gal. 2:21; 3:29; 2 Cor. 5:14 (v.l.); Matt. 12:28/Luke 11:20; Heb. 12:8; cf. BDR 451.2. Verse 18 is not connected, therefore, with verse 17c or 17b, but with 17a. Καί (ἄρα καί) indicates that verse 18 mentions another consequence of what is said in verse 17a, just like 17b and 17c are consequences of the statement in verse 17a. A consequence does not have to be mentioned immediately after the antecedent; see, for instance, Gal. 5:11.

[2] In verse 18 the phrase 'in Christ' (ἐν Χριστῷ) specifies the noun (οἱ κοιμηθέντες) and not the verb (ἀπώλοντο). Similarly, the phrase ἐν Χριστῷ in 1 Thess. 4:16 governs the noun οἱ νεκροί, not the verb ἀναστήσονται; see P. Hoffmann, *Toten*, p. 223; H.-A. Wilcke, *Zwischenreich*, p. 139; H. Merklein, 'Theologe', p. 403; T. Holtz, *Thessalonicher*, p. 201; however, cf. A. Lindemann, 'Entwicklung', pp. 379-382. It is not necessary that the article is repeated, see, for instance, Ῥοῦφον τὸν ἐκλεκτὸν ἐν κυρίῳ (Rom. 16:13), and πᾶσιν τοῖς ἁγίοις ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ (Phil. 1:1). Cf. BDR 272 and chapter II, p. 53.

[3] Verses 25-28 suggest that the handing over of the kingdom (v. 24b) will take place after the destruction of every rule, authority, and power (v. 24c); see chapter III, pp. 58-60.

[4] The fact that Paul does not mention any other eschatological event in this passage, for instance the final judgement, does not mean that he did not expect any other escha-

(5) Paul ends his argumentation in favour of the future reality of the eschatological resurrection with some arguments *ad hominem*, framed in the style of a diatribe (vv. 29-34).[1] In these verses Paul does not actually refute the denial, but rather challenges the Corinthians personally by using arguments from personal experience: the personal experience of Paul, of the Corinthians, and of life in general. These arguments are only additional. They are not directed against any specific point of the Corinthian position on life after death.[2] The strength of these arguments is their rhetorical power. 'If the dead are not raised at all,' Paul asks the Corinthians, 'why are people baptized on their behalf?' (v. 29). In other words, the ritual of vicarious baptism is based on the assumption that there is a future resurrection. For the same reason Paul is willing to risk his life as an apostle time and again (vv. 30-32).[3] Furthermore, living in the expectation of the future resurrection is a generally accepted way of living. Otherwise, one should eat, drink, and be merry, for life is short (vv. 32-34).

(6) In Paul's opposition to the Corinthian denial of the eschatological resurrection, the belief in Jesus' resurrection and the expectation of Jesus' coming are of major importance. With the help of the belief in Jesus' resurrection Paul sets up a quasi-logical argumentation in which he claims that the eschatological resurrection is the effect of Jesus' resurrection. Subsequently, Paul unfolds the idea of the thus established relationship between the two resurrections in two further ideas: Jesus' resurrection is the beginning of the eschatological resurrection and people will be raised through participation in Jesus' resurrection. By connecting the eschatological resurrection to Jesus' parousia Paul emphasizes that the resurrection will take place in the future. Christians will be raised at the end of time when Christ will return and defeat

---

tological events. It rather shows that the description of the eschatological scenario in 1 Cor. 15:24-28 is entirely determined by Paul's refutation of the Corinthian viewpoint.

[1] A diatribe (διατριβή) is a philosophical, yet popular, speech consisting of ethical teaching and extensive expositions of rather simple ideas. It is characterized by the use of traditional and popular images, a more or less colloquial style, and a direct approach to the audience. See T. Schmeller, *Paulus und die 'Diatribe'. Eine vergleichende Stilinterpretation* (NTA 19 n.F.; Münster: Aschendorff, 1987), pp. 332-387, who compared verses 29-49 of Paul's exposition of the eschatological resurrection with some classical examples of the diatribe; cf. S.K. Stowers, *The Diatribe and Paul's Letter to the Romans* (SBL.DS 57; Chico: Scholars Press, 1981).

[2] Therefore, they can only partially be used to reconstruct the opinion of the Corinthian opponents; cf. G. Barth, 'Frage', *passim*.

[3] For the list of hardships in these verses, see A.J. Malherbe, 'The Beasts at Ephesus', *JBL* 87 (1968), pp. 71-80.

death for ever. With these ideas Paul hopes to convince the Corinthians that there will be a resurrection at the end of time. In the second part of his discussion of the eschatological resurrection (vv. 35-58), Paul tries to take away the major Corinthian objection to a resurrection at the end of time, its bodily character.

II. THE ESCHATOLOGICAL RESURRECTION AND JESUS' RESURRECTION

The relationship between Jesus' resurrection and the eschatological resurrection established in verses 12-19 plays a role in verses 20-23 in the following two ideas: (a) Jesus' resurrection marks the beginning of the eschatological resurrection (vv. 20, 23); (b) deceased Christians will be made alive in Christ, that is, they will participate in Jesus' resurrection because of the unity between Christ and his followers (vv. 21-22). Each of these ideas will be examined in detail in sections b and c. Section a will give an analysis of the view that 'Christ has been raised from the dead as the first-fruits (ἀπαρχή) of those who have fallen asleep' (v. 20), which seems to be the pivotal point of both ideas.

a. *Jesus as the first-fruits of the dead*

(1) The idea that Jesus' resurrection is the beginning of the eschatological resurrection (vv. 20, 23) and the idea that the eschatological resurrection will be a participation in Jesus' resurrection (vv. 21-22) are closely related. They are both expressions of the view that 'Christ has been raised from the dead as the 'first-fruits (ἀπαρχή) of those who have fallen asleep' (v. 20).[1] In the former idea the emphasis is on the aspect of Jesus being the 'first one' to have risen: Jesus is the first one of those who will be raised; his resurrection will be followed by that of the rest. In the latter idea the emphasis is on the aspect of Jesus being the 'representative' of those who will be raised: Christians will share in the resurrection of their representative. Both aspects, i.e., Jesus' role as the first one and as representative, are embraced by the word first-fruits (ἀπαρχή).

The word ἀπαρχή, generally translated as 'first-fruits' or 'firstlings', is a cultic term, used by both Jews and non-Jews, denoting the offering of the first or best part of belongings or possessions, acquired either by conquest or simply by labour. As a representation of the rest, the ἀπαρχαί were offered to the deity as the necessary conse-

---

[1] For the well-known euphemistic use of κοιμᾶσθαι (to sleep, fall asleep) for 'to die', see Bauer, col. 890; P. Hoffmann, *Toten*, pp. 186-206; see also the next section of this chapter, pp. 52-54.

cration of the possessions before further use was allowed.[1] For the Jews until the first century C.E., the Feast of Weeks, held on the fiftieth day (Pentecost) after Passover at the end of the cereal harvest, was the time when the 'first-fruits' of the harvest were offered.[2] After the wheat harvest was finished, two loaves of bread (ἀπαρχαί) were baked from the wheat just harvested and brought into the temple as an offering to God. In the Septuagint, the word ἀπαρχή is not only used in this specific, cultic meaning; it is also a common term for offerings or taxes.[3] Occasionally, the term is used for first-born children.[4]

Paul uses the word five times in his letters. In Rom. 11:16 he explicitly refers to the ritual of the Feast of Weeks: if the first-fruits (ἀπαρχή) offered to God are holy, then the dough from which these first-fruits (loaves of bread) are made is also holy. The first-fruits, being the first and best part of the whole from which they are taken, represent the rest (the dough), and thus the rest participates in the status of the first-fruits. In another passage, Rom. 8:23, Paul mentions that in the present time of hardships Christians have already received the ἀπαρχή of the Spirit, i.e., the first part of the Spirit, which is a representation of what they will receive at the end of time: adoption as sons and full salvation. Thus, in both passages ἀπαρχή is used in the meaning of 'first and representative part', although in the second case (Rom. 8:23) the term is used metaphorically. In two other passages, ἀπαρχή is used for 'first one', namely, the first in a series of many. In 1 Cor. 16:15 the household of Stephanas is called the ἀπαρχή of Achaia, and in Rom. 16:5 Epaenetus the ἀπαρχή of Asia. Apparently, Stephanas and Epaenetus were the first Christians of their region, and they had been followed by many more.

In 1 Cor. 15:20 Paul uses the word in its general meaning but metaphorically: the ἀπαρχή is the first and representative part of a whole. There is no reason to assume that Paul is referring here to the ritual of the Jewish Feast of Weeks, either directly or indirectly, as some scholars suggest. The passage itself does not imply that such a reference plays a role here. Furthermore, the scholars in question be-

---

[1] See P. Stengel, 'ἀπαρχαί', *PRE*, vol. I (1894), cols. 2666-2668.

[2] The cereal harvest started at the time of Passover with the harvest of barley and was concluded fifty days later with the harvest of wheat. After the cereal harvest the Feast of Weeks, Pentecost, was celebrated; Exod. 23:16; 34:22; Lev. 23:10, 15-21; Num. 15:17-21; Tob. 2:1; 2 Macc. 12:31-32. In the Septuagint ἀπαρχή is not the only word used for first-fruits; synonyms are πρωτογέν(ν)ημα and ἀρχή. See R. de Vaux, *Les institutions de l'Ancien Testament* (Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1960), vol. II, pp. 395-397.

[3] See, for instance, Exod. 25:2-3; Num. 18:8, 11; Ezek. 45:13.

[4] Ps. 78(77):51; 105(104):36; Ezek. 44:30.

lieve that, by designating Christ as ἀπαρχή, Paul meant to convey the idea that Jesus' resurrection is a 'guarantee' for the coming about of the eschatological resurrection, just as the first-fruits would have been a guarantee for the success of the rest of the harvest.[1] But the attribution of this idea to Paul rests on an erroneous view of the ritual of the offering of first-fruits. The first-fruits were offered at the end of the harvest, not at its beginning, and the offerings were made as a consecration of the harvest already finished, not as a guarantee for a successful harvest to come.

The designation of the risen Jesus as the 'first-fruits of those who have fallen asleep' (v. 20) means that Jesus has been raised as the first and the representative of those who will be raised. In the following verses (20-23) Paul elucidates both functions of the risen Jesus as the first-fruits of those who have fallen asleep.[2] The idea that Jesus has been raised as the *first* of those who have fallen asleep is explicated in verse 23: Jesus has been raised as the first one, those of Christ (οἱ τοῦ Χριστοῦ) will be raised later on, at the time of Jesus' coming. The people of the second category, those of Christ, will follow the one of the first category, the ἀπαρχή, Jesus. The notion that Jesus has been raised as the *representative* of those who have fallen asleep, is explicated in verses 21-22. All people share in the death of Adam because through Adam death came into the world. Similarly, all Christians share in the resurrection of Jesus because through Jesus resurrection came into the world (vv. 21-22). Christians will participate in the resurrection of their representative, the ἀπαρχή, Jesus.

(2) Thus, the view that 'Christ has been raised from the dead as the first-fruits of those who have fallen asleep' (v. 20) functions as the pivot of two ideas: Jesus' resurrection marks the beginning of the eschatological resurrection (v. 23), Christians will be raised through participation in Jesus' resurrection (vv. 21-22).

---

[1] For instance, J. Weiss, *Korintherbrief*, p. 356; G.D. Fee, *Corinthians*, pp. 748-751.

[2] Although these two functions can be distinguished and seen as mutually independent, they are closely related.

b. *Jesus' resurrection as the beginning of the eschatological resurrection*

(1) In verse 23 Paul asserts that there are two stages of resurrection corresponding to two categories of people to be raised.[1] Jesus forms the first category. He has already been raised. He will be followed by the second category, those of Christ, at the end of time. With the word ἔπειτα Paul creates a chronological order between the two resurrections: Christ first, and then (ἔπειτα), 'at (the time of) his coming', those who belong to Christ.

(2) There is no reason to assume that Paul speaks about a third category of people to be raised, or a third stage of the resurrection; namely, that of the non-Christians or the unrighteous ones. Nevertheless, many scholars argue that Paul does speak of such a category, indicated in some way in τὸ τέλος in verse 24.[2] Although they admit that τὸ τέλος cannot mean anything else than 'the end' and not 'the rest' as was proposed by some earlier scholars,[3] they still presume that with this phrase Paul takes into account a third stage of the resurrection, that of the non-Christians.

They adduce the following arguments for this view. (a) The parallelism in verses 21-22 demands that the first πάντες in verse 22a, referring to all people, Christians and non-Christians, corresponds to the second πάντες in verse 22b.[4] Since all people (πάντες), namely Christians and non-Christians, participate in Adam's death, the 'all' (πάντες) who participate in Jesus' resurrection are Christians as well as non-Christians. In verse 23 Paul speaks about the resurrection of Christians (οἱ τοῦ Χριστοῦ) as the second stage of the resurrection. Consequently, with the phrase τὸ τέλος in verse 24, he must be referring to the resurrection of non-Christians, the third stage. (b) The chronological order of the resurrections denoted by ἔπειτα in verse 23 is contin-

---

[1] The word τάγμα is best translated by 'group' or 'order'; it is frequently used to denote bodies of soldiers; LSJ, p. 1752.

[2] For a list of authors who argue this way, see G. Sellin, *Streit*, p. 264, note 12; A. Lindemann, 'Paulus und die korinthische Eschatologie. Zur These von einer "Entwicklung" im paulinischen Denken', *NTS* 37 (1991), pp. 373-399, may be added to Sellin's list.

[3] For instance, H. Lietzmann, *An die Korinther I-II* (HNT; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 4th edition augmented by W.G. Kümmel, 1949), p. 80. For a convincing refutation of this thesis, see H.-A. Wilcke, *Das Problem eines messianischen Zwischenreichs bei Paulus* (AThANT 51; Zürich/Stuttgart: Zwingli, 1967), pp. 85-92.

[4] A. Lindemann, 'Entwicklung', p. 383.

ued by εἶτα in verse 24: εἶτα τὸ τέλος. The resurrection of Christians is thus presented as having a sequel composed of the raising of the others, the non-Christians.[1] (c) The current Jewish conception of the eschatological resurrection, namely, a resurrection followed by the last judgement, demands a resurrection of the unrighteous ones, in this case non-Christians, as well.[2]

However, these arguments are insufficient to sustain the supposition that τὸ τέλος refers to the resurrection of the unrighteous ones. With regard to the first argument it should be noted that, in contradistinction to πάντες in verse 22a, πάντες in verse 22b does not refer to all people, Christians and non-Christians, but only to Christians. The parallelism between the two clauses of verse 22 does not lie in the fact that both groups are identical, but in the fact that for both groups the representative determines the fate of the group.[3] The unity with Adam leads to death, the unity with Christ leads to resurrection.[4] Since only Christians are united with Christ, only Christians will be made alive through Christ. It is unimaginable, in Paul's view, that non-Christians participate in the unity with Christ and in a resurrection with him.[5] Consequently, because in verse 22b Paul speaks about a resurrection of Christians only, there is no reason to assume that οἱ τοῦ Χριστοῦ (verse 23) and τὸ τέλος (verse 24) are the two components of the πάντες who according to verse 22b will be raised.

The two other arguments (b and c) cannot be maintained, either. The words ἔπειτα and εἶτα may indicate a continuous chronological order. But if so, all that is said is that 'the end' (τὸ τέλος), that is, the

---

[1] A similar use of ἔπειτα and εἶτα for denoting a chronological order is found in 1 Cor. 15:5-7; cf. J. Weiss, *Korintherbrief*, pp. 357-358; H. Lietzmann, *Korinther*, pp. 80-81.

[2] J. Weiss, *Korintherbrief*, p. 358.

[3] Cf. C.E. Hill, 'Paul's Understanding of Christ's Kingdom in 1 Corinthians 15:20-28', *NovT* 30 (1988), pp. 297-320, esp. 305; C. Wolff, *Der erste Brief des Paulus an die Korinther* (ThHK; Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1982), vol. II, pp. 179-180.

[4] The phrase ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ is grammatically related to the verb ζῳοποιηθήσονται and not to the noun πάντες. Contrary to similar phrases like οἱ κοιμηθέντες ἐν Χριστῷ (1 Cor. 15:18) or οἱ νεκροὶ ἐν Χριστῷ (1 Thess. 4:16), the noun does not precede but follows the phrase ἐν (τῷ) Χριστῷ; cf. chapter I, p. 45. Therefore, in 1 Cor. 15:22 the phrase ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ indicates the way through which people will be made alive, namely through their unity with Christ.

[5] Consequently, the κεκοιμημένοι (v. 20) of which Jesus is the first-fruits are only Christians. However, the conclusion that only Christians will rise does not follow from Paul's use of κοιμᾶσθαι, as some have suggested (for a list of these authors, see P. Hoffmann, *Toten*, pp. 186-206), but from Paul's idea that Jesus is the representative of those who have fallen asleep. Only Christians may consider themselves as being represented by Jesus.

handing over of the kingdom to God (v. 24), will take place after the resurrection of the Christians. The word εἶτα provides no basis to assume that, with the phrase τὸ τέλος, Paul intended to indicate that another group of people is meant to be raised, viz. the non-Christians. Finally, there was no generally accepted Jewish notion of the eschatological resurrection in Paul's time. In contemporary Jewish writings in which an eschatological resurrection is mentioned, the resurrection is depicted in many different ways.[1] One of the numerous different conceptions is that the future resurrection will only be the lot of the righteous ones.[2]

The fact that Paul does not mention a resurrection of the non-Christians here, need not mean that he did not reckon with it at all.[3] There are other eschatological events which Paul mentions in other passages but does not mention in his succinct eschatological scenario in 1 Cor. 15:20-28. One example is the judgement at the time of Jesus' coming.[4] Paul mentions here only those events and aspects which are necessary for his argument. He avoids making things more complicated than necessary and therefore refrains from mentioning a resurrection of non-Christians.[5]

(3) The concept that Jesus' resurrection is the beginning of the eschatological resurrection is the first idea in which Paul develops the notion of the relationship between Jesus' resurrection and the eschatological resurrection established in verses 12-19. The idea is an elaboration of

---

[1] See chapter V, pp. 85-87.

[2] See, for instance, 1 Enoch 91:10; 92:3-5.

[3] See W.V. Crockett, 'Ultimate Restoration of all Mankind: 1 Cor. 15:22', in: E.A. Livingstone (ed.), *Studia Biblica 1978. Sixth International Congress on Biblical Studies* (JSNT.S 3; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1980), vol. III, pp. 83-87; see also chapter V, p. 79.

[4] See, for instance, Rom. 14:10; 1 Cor. 4:5; 2 Cor. 5:10.

[5] V. Hasler has argued that since Paul speaks only about a resurrection of Christians (righteous ones) in these verses, Paul does not present Jesus' resurrection as the beginning of the eschatological resurrection. Hasler holds that the idea of the risen Jesus as the first-fruits (ἀπαρχή) reflects a christological view: Jesus is the first instalment of the salvation of the righteous ones (Rom. 8:23; 2 Cor. 1:22). The eschatological resurrection is not in view in these verses, according to him; V. Hasler, 'Credo und Auferstehung in Korinth. Erwägungen zu 1 Kor. 15', *ThZ* 40 (1984), pp. 12-33, esp. 25-26; cf. J. Baumgarten, *Apokalyptik*, pp. 100, 126, 130, 234; F. Froitzheim, *Christologie und Eschatologie bei Paulus* (fzb 25; Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1979), pp. 111-144. However, even if the eschatological resurrection is restricted to that of the righteous ones (here: the Christians) only, which is a perfectly normal Jewish view on resurrection, it is still the eschatological resurrection which Paul is speaking about. Of this resurrection as a whole Jesus' resurrection is the first stage, to be followed by the resurrection of the Christians at the end of time (v. 23).

the view that 'Christ has been raised as the first-fruits of those who have fallen asleep.' According to Paul, there are two categories of people who will be raised: Jesus, representing the first category, and Christians, representing the second category. These two categories of people will be raised in a chronological order, first Christ, then, at the end of time, those belonging to Christ.

c. *The eschatological resurrection as participation in Jesus' resurrection*

(1) The idea that the eschatological resurrection will take place through participation in Jesus' resurrection is the second elaboration of the view that 'Christ has been raised as the first-fruits of those who have fallen asleep' (v. 20). In this idea Paul emphasizes the aspect of Jesus being the *representative* of those who will be raised. In verses 21-22 he establishes that, just as death came into the world through Adam, resulting in the death of all people who are represented by Adam, so resurrection came into the world through Christ, resulting in the resurrection of all people who are represented by Christ. With regard to the participation in Adam's death, Paul speaks about all people, both Christians and non-Christians (v. 22a). But with regard to the participation in Jesus' resurrection (v. 22b), Paul speaks about Christians only, since only Christians may consider themselves as being represented by Jesus.[1] Through their unity with Adam, all people share in Adam's death; through their unity with Christ, Christians share in Jesus' resurrection.[2]

(2) The idea that mortality came into the world through Adam, and that through him and because of him everyone is mortal, is a traditional Jewish idea.[3] The punishment for Adam's transgression of the one commandment which God had given him was mortality for him

---

[1] See the previous section of this chapter, pp. 52-54.

[2] The verb ζωοποιεῖν is a synonym of ἐγείρειν; see Rom. 4:17; 8:11; 1 Pet. 3:18; John 5:21.

[3] The idea is based on Gen. 3:19 and is found in, e.g., 4 Ezra 3:7 (cf. 3:21; 7:116-126); Sir. 25:24 (cf. 15:14-17); 2 Apoc. Bar. 54:15 (cf. 17:3; 19:8; 23:4). See E. Brandenburger, *Adam und Christus. Exegetisch-religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu Röm. 5:12-21 (1. Kor. 15)* (WMANT 7; Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1962), pp. 15-64; R. Scroggs, *The Last Adam. A Study in Pauline Anthropology* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966); J.R. Levison, *Portraits of Adam in Early Judaism. From Sirach to 2 Baruch* (JSPE.S 1; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1988).

and all his descendants. The fact that it was Adam's sin, his transgression of God's commandment, which caused mortality is not explicitly mentioned here by Paul.[1] Paul is only interested in the effect, death, which is the ultimate fate of all people who like Adam transgress God's commandments. Adamic mortality is therefore not something that each person inherits naturally; rather, it is something that each person calls down upon himself because he or she transgresses God's commandments in the same way as Adam did.[2] There is a spiritual, instead of a natural, unity between Adam and humanity with regard to death.[3]

In contrast with the unity between Adam and humanity with regard to death, Paul places the unity between Christ and Christians with regard to resurrection. Just as Adam is the representative of all people in so far as they die, Jesus is the representative of all Christians in so far as they will be raised. The idea that Jesus and Christians form a unity must have been a familiar idea for the Corinthians. It is found throughout the earliest Christian literature and it is a central theme in 1 Corinthians.[4] Paul speaks about this idea of unity with various turns of phrase, but perhaps most directly with the phrases 'in Christ', 'through Christ', and 'with Christ'. Here Paul uses the phrase 'in Christ' (πάντες ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ), specified in the following verse with the phrase 'those of Christ' (οἱ τοῦ Χριστοῦ).[5] Paul even extends his 'in language' to the unity between Adam and humanity (ἐν τῷ Ἀδάμ).[6]

(3) The idea that the eschatological resurrection will take place through participation in Jesus' resurrection is the second idea with which Paul represents the relationship between Jesus' resurrection and the eschatological resurrection. Altogether this idea is elaborated in three ways: in the idea that Jesus has been raised as the first-fruits (representative) of

---

[1] In most parallel passages this thought is expressed in one way or another. Paul does use this part of the concept in Rom. 5:12-21 and indirectly in 1 Cor. 15:56; see H.W. Hollander, J. Holleman, 'The Relationship between Death, Sin, and Law in 1 Cor. 15:56', *NovT* 35 (1993), pp. 270-291.

[2] J.R. Levison, *Portraits*, pp. 156-159.

[3] Oftentimes this notion of unity is described with phrases like 'racial solidarity', or 'corporate unity'. Both have been proven to be inadequate; see A.J.M. Wedderburn, *Baptism*, pp. 352-354.

[4] See, for instance, 1 Cor. 6:12-20; 12:12-31.

[5] The genitive τοῦ Χριστοῦ is a genitive of relationship (BDR 162.7). But the relationship determines and qualifies those who live in this relationship with Christ, so that the genitive almost has the value of a genitive of quality or of an adjective. See also Gal. 3:28-29 where being 'in Christ' stands parallel with being 'of Christ'.

[6] In none of the parallel passages on Adam as the one who inaugurated mortality is 'in language' used. Thus, the 'in language' in 1 Cor. 15:21 is Paul's own contribution.

those who have fallen asleep; in the comparison of the Christians' unity with Christ in his resurrection with people's unity with Adam in his death; and in Paul's use of the phrases 'in Christ' and 'of Christ'.

III. THE ESCHATOLOGICAL RESURRECTION AND JESUS' PAROUSIA

In verse 23 Paul emphatically links the eschatological resurrection to Jesus' parousia: those of Christ will be raised at his second coming. Paul then continues by giving a succinct scenario of the end of time of which the defeat of death (v. 26) is the climax. This eschatological scenario will be examined first (section a). Subsequently, Paul's ideas about the defeat of death will be analysed (section b).

a. *Paul's scenario of the last events*

(1) By connecting the eschatological resurrection to Jesus' future coming Paul places the Christians' resurrection in an eschatological framework. His reason for doing this is clear: he wants to stress that the resurrection is an event which will take place in the future. He thereby argues against the Corinthian view that spiritual immortality is to be received directly after death.[1] Within the eschatological framework of the events to come, the defeat of death forms the climax. The mention of the defeat of death also fits Paul's attack on the Corinthian view on life after death.[2] Death, which entered the world at the time of Adam, will not be defeated before the end of time. Thus, Paul's presentation of the events at the end of time (vv. 23-28), particularly his linking of the eschatological resurrection to Jesus' parousia and his mention of the defeat of death, forms a most relevant part of his argumentation.

(2) Jesus' final appearance marks the end of time. Paul simply calls it 'the end' (τὸ τέλος). The announcement of 'the end' (v. 24a) is followed by two dependent clauses, both beginning with ὅταν (vv. 24b and c), which describe what will happen at 'the end': Jesus will hand over the kingdom to God and destroy every rule, authority, and power. Because of the parallelism between the two clauses (vv. 24b and c) Jesus must be the subject in both the first and the second clause. The fact that Jesus is the subject in the first clause (v. 24b) is absolutely

---

[1] See chapter I, p. 38.
[2] See chapter I, p. 38-39.

clear. God is the one to whom the kingdom is handed over and this can only be done by Jesus, as is also stated in verse 28b. The notion that Jesus is also the subject of καταργήσῃ in verse 24c has been disputed by various scholars. They argue that the one who destroys every rule, authority, and power (v. 24c) cannot be Jesus due to the fact that the following verses (25b and 27) describe how *God* subjects all enemies under Jesus' feet.[1] Therefore, God must be the subject of καταργήσῃ in verse 24c, too.[2] Others have turned the argument around. If Jesus is the subject in verse 24c on the basis of the fact that he is already the subject in verse 24b, then he must also be the subject in verses 25b and 27, where the subjection of the enemies is described with the help of the citations from the Psalms. It is not God who subjects the enemies under Jesus' feet, they argue, but Jesus who subjects them under his own feet.[3]

However, the idea that Jesus destroys every rule, authority, and power (v. 24c) is not necessarily in discord with the idea that God places the enemies under Jesus' feet (vv. 25b and 27). Paul certainly regards God as the subject of the subjection of the enemies under Jesus' feet (vv. 25b, 27). This can be deduced from verse 28.[4] Thus, there is a change of subjects, from Jesus to God, between verses 25a (δεῖ βασιλεύειν)[5] and 25b (θῇ), where Paul quotes or refers to Ps. 110 (109):1.[6] The idea, expressed with the help of the quotations from the

---

[1] See U. Heil, 'Theo-logische Interpretation von 1 Kor. 15,23-28', *ZNW* 84 (1993), pp. 27-35 and the literature listed there; cf. M.C. de Boer, 'Paul's Use of a Resurrection Tradition in 1 Corinthians 15:20-28', in: R. Bieringer (ed.), *Correspondence*, forthcoming

[2] So, for instance, Heil himself; see U. Heil, 'Interpretation', pp. 28-29.

[3] See J. Lambrecht, 'Paul's Christological Use of Scripture in 1 Cor. 15:20-28', *NTS* 28 (1982), pp. 502-527; J. Lambrecht, 'Structure and Line of Thought in 1 Cor. 15:23-28', *NovT* 32 (1990), pp. 143-151; G.D. Fee, *Corinthians*, p. 755; cf. U. Heil, 'Interpretation', pp. 27-28.

[4] In verse 28 it is said that in the end the Son will subject himself to 'the one who put all things in subjection under him.' The 'one who put all things in subjection' (τῷ ὑποτάξαντι) can only be God. Since God is the subject in verse 28, he must also be the subject of the same action described in verses 27 (ὑπέταξεν, ὑποτάξαντος) and 25b (θῇ). For many more arguments to consider God as the subject in verses 25b and 27, see U. Heil, 'Interpretation', pp. 29-35.

[5] The correspondence between verse 24a (παραδιδῷ τὴν βασιλείαν) and verse 25a (δεῖ βασιλεύειν) suggests that Jesus is the subject in verse 25a.

[6] If one argues that God is the subject of verse 24c, as Heil does, there would be a double change of subjects in verses 24 and 25: παραδιδῷ: Jesus (24b), καταργήσῃ: God (24c), δεῖ αὐτὸν βασιλεύειν: Jesus (25a), and θῇ: God (25b). This is needlessly complicated. One must take into account a change of subjects somewhere between 24b (παραδιδῷ, Jesus) and 25b (θῇ, God). A change at the beginning of the quotation (v. 25b) is the most simple and plausible solution.

Psalms, is that Jesus is the instrument, the acting subject, through whom God will introduce and establish his reign. The poet of Psalm 110(109) presents his 'lord' (the king) as remaining passive: he sits on his throne while God is defeating his enemies by making them into a footstool. Yet the idea behind the image is that the king and God are so closely related that, although the king is the actual ruler, it is God who exercises his power through the king. The king is the perfect servant of God so that through him God reigns over Israel. In 1 Cor. 15:25-28 we find the same idea: although it is Jesus who actually destroys every rule, authority, and power, it is God who acts through Jesus.[1] Jesus acts on behalf of God so that God's reign is established and then Jesus will hand over his kingdom to God.[2] Thus, Jesus is the subject of both clauses starting with ὅταν in verse 24. It is plausible that first the enemies will be destroyed (vv. 25-28a) and subsequently the kingdom will be handed over to God (v. 28b). The event mentioned in the second ὅταν-clause precedes the event mentioned in the first one in time.

(3) The phrase 'the end' (τὸ τέλος) refers here to the absolute end of human history, the very last day on which the old aeon will be finished completely and the new aeon will start.[3] This 'end of time' should be distinguished from what is usually called the 'eschaton', that is, the time and events preceding and leading up to this last day. The eschaton is the last period of time of the old aeon, for instance, the last generation. According to Paul, this last period of time, the eschaton, has already started. 'When the fullness of time had come,' Paul writes in Gal. 4:4, 'God sent his Son, born of a woman.' Thus, the eschaton, the last period of human history, had started with Jesus' coming into the world.[4] Since then, as Paul says elsewhere, 'the ends of ages have come' (1 Cor. 10:11).[5] This last part of human history will end with the (second) coming of Christ, the revelation which all Christians await

---

[1] On the close relationship between God and his eschatological agent in both Jewish apocalyptic and early Christian literature, see L.J. Kreitzer, *Eschatology, passim.*

[2] The mention of the handing over of the kingdom to God by Jesus would be superfluous if it is God himself who establishes his reign by defeating the enemies.

[3] The word τέλος is not a technical term to indicate this absolute end of time; it can refer to the end of anything. There are, however, parallels to Paul's use of the word τέλος in relation with the end of human history in 1 Cor. 15:24; see 1 Pet. 4:7; Matt. 10:22; 24:6, 13; Sib. Or. 3:797; Wis. 7:18; Gr. Apoc. Esdrae 3:13; cf. 4 Ezra 12:34; 1 Cor. 10:11.

[4] See also Mark 1:15; cf. chapter V, p. 92 and chapter VI, pp. 116-118.

[5] Note the plural form, 'the ends' (τὰ τέλη).

eagerly, on the day called the 'day of the Lord' (1 Cor. 1:7-8).[1] In other words, the appearance of Christ and the day of the Lord will be the end of the eschaton.[2]

By sending Jesus at the fullness of time, God has begun to save his elect as the prophets had said he would do at the end of time. Those who follow Jesus, the Christians, may consider themselves to be already saved by Jesus. But just as the old aeon still awaits its complete consummation, complete salvation lies still in the future. Christians have received the first-fruits of the Spirit but they are still waiting for their full salvation (Rom. 8:23). Elsewhere, Paul writes that Christians have already been justified by Jesus, but they have not yet been saved (Rom. 5:9). The tension between the 'already' and the 'not yet'[3] is also present in Paul's speaking about the kingdom of God. On the one hand, the kingdom of God is something which will be received in the future (1 Thess. 2:12; 1 Cor. 6:9-10; 15:50; Gal. 5:21); on the other hand, this kingdom is already present within the community of believers (1 Cor. 4:20; Rom. 14:17).[4] The kingdom which Jesus will hand over to God the Father, as Paul states in 1 Cor. 15:24, has also begun already. Paul does not say that Jesus' kingdom will be established with his coming in the near future, but that Jesus will hand over the kingdom to God some time after his coming.[5]

Jesus' kingship started when he was exalted into heaven. Through his resurrection Jesus has been installed by God as 'Lord' (κύριος, Rom. 10:9); God has exalted him and given him the name (κύριος) above all names (Phil. 2:9). He now sits at the right hand of God (Rom.

---

[1] See also 1 Thess. 5:1-4 where the 'day' of the Lord stands for the end; cf. 1 Cor. 3:13.

[2] The use of the word 'eschatological' in the phrase 'eschatological resurrection' is therefore somewhat misleading, for it signifies the resurrection on the last day, at the time of Jesus' parousia, and not a resurrection which takes place during the last part of history.

[3] For this tension of the 'already' and the 'not yet' in Paul, see M. de Jonge, *Christology in Context. The Earliest Christian Response to Jesus* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1988), pp. 115-116.

[4] This way of speaking about the kingdom of God agrees with how the gospel writers speak about it; see E. Schweizer, '1 Korinther 15,20-28 als Zeugnis paulinischer Eschatologie und ihrer Verwandschaft mit der Verkündigung Jesu', in: E.E. Ellis, E. Grässer (eds.), *Jesus und Paulus* (FS W.G. Kümmel; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1975), pp. 301-314.

[5] H.-A. Wilcke's refutation of the idea that Paul in 1 Cor. 15:23-28, or in any of his other letters, refers to a so-called 'messianic kingdom' as found, for instance, in 4 Ezra 7:26-29, is generally accepted; H.-A. Wilcke, *Zwischenreich, passim.* See also C.E. Hill, 'Understanding', pp. 297-320.

8:34).[1] When Jesus returns, he will act in accordance with this lordship or kingship: he will save the Christians from God's wrath (1 Thess. 1:10; Rom. 5:9) and submit everything and everyone to his rule (Phil. 3:20; 1 Cor. 15:24-27). Since Jesus' lordship and kingship has already started, the subjection of the enemies to Jesus' rule is a process already on its way, too.[2] The final goal will be the submission of *all* enemies under Jesus' feet.[3] With the destruction of death, the submission will be completed.[4] Thus, the events mentioned as 'the end' in verse 24 are the very last events indeed. Jesus' kingship in God's kingdom will be completed when Jesus will have destroyed every rule, authority, and enemy. Then the kingdom will be handed over to God, so that God may be 'all in all'.

(4) According to Paul, the eschaton, which God has already started with Jesus' life on earth, will be completed with Jesus' parousia. Then Jesus will carry out in full the kingship which God has already given him. As God's ideal king, Jesus will defeat all enemies, the last of which is death, and will hand over the kingdom to God so that God will be all in all. At that time, that is, at the time of Jesus' appearance, the resurrection will take place. Paul makes it clear that the resurrection is an integral part of God's eschatological scenario.

---

[1] See also Rom. 14:9; Acts 2:36.

[2] See G. Münderlein, *Die Überwindung der Mächte. Studien zu theologischen Vorstellungen des apokalyptischen Judentums und bei Paulus* (Ph.D. diss., Zürich, 1971), pp. 107-109.

[3] The emphasis on the word 'all' (πᾶς, πάντα), which is used ten times in verses 24-28, indicates that the subjection of the enemies is a process which has already begun. Some enemies may already have been subjected, but in the end *all* enemies will be subjected.

[4] Despite the present tense of καταργεῖται in verse 26, the destruction of death is a future event; for this futuristic use of the present tense, see BDR 323; J.H. Moulton et alii, *Grammar*, vol. III, p. 63; cf. C. Wolff, *Korinther*, vol. II, pp. 182-183. Some authors have suggested that Paul's use of the present tense indicates that the destruction of death has already started, namely, through Jesus' resurrection; G.D. Fee, *Corinthians*, p. 757; M.C. de Boer, 'Use', forthcoming. However, although this idea may be present in Heb. 2:14 (2:9), Rev. 1:18, and perhaps, in an early form, in Rom. 6:9, it is not in 1 Corinthians 15. In reaction to the Corinthian ideas about a personal victory over death at the moment someone dies, Paul aims to show that the destruction of death, through resurrection, is a future event (see 1 Cor. 15:54-56).

b. *The defeat of death*

(1) When Jesus comes he will accomplish two things, as stated in verse 24: he will destroy every rule, authority, and power, and he will hand over the kingdom to God. The theme of Jesus' destruction of every rule, authority, and power is worked out in the following verses. The forces mentioned are the enemies which are to be defeated before God's kingdom comes in fullness.[1] To give expression to this idea that God will subject all enemies to Jesus,[2] Paul uses two verses from the Psalms (110[109]:1 and 8:7).[3] Between the two quotations from the Psalms Paul mentions the defeat of death as the last enemy. Clearly, in light of Paul's exposition of the eschatological resurrection, the defeat of death is the climax of the events at the end of time. When every enemy will be subjected to Jesus, Jesus himself will subject himself to God.[4]

(2) The use of Psalm 110(109):1 to describe Jesus' exaltation and enthronement as Lord has a pre-Pauline origin. It is found throughout the scriptures of the New Testament. This shows that it stems from the oldest stratum of the Christian tradition.[5] Very remarkable is Paul's use here of part c of Ps. 110(109):1, which deals with the subjection of the enemies under the king's feet. The words of verse 1b, whereby the king is depicted as sitting at the right hand of God, is the passage of Ps. 110(109) which is most frequently used in early Christian literature.[6]

---

[1] 'Every rule, authority, and power' are the hostile cosmic powers which will be destroyed at the end of time. Paul varies his language in describing these supernatural powers (1 Cor. 5:5; 8:4-5; 10:20; Rom. 8:38; cf. Gal. 4:8-9), but they can all be categorized under the heading 'hostile cosmic powers'; see G. Münderlein, *Überwindung*, pp. 116-117.

[2] For God being the subject of θῇ (v. 25a), see the previous section.

[3] There are two major differences between Paul's quotation and the text of Ps. 110(109):1 as we find it in the Septuagint; namely, the insertion of πάντας (πάντας τοὺς ἐχθρούς) and the phrase ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ instead of ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν σου. Both variations are probably due to influence from Ps. 8:7; cf. M.C. de Boer, 'Use', forthcoming; C.D. Stanley, *Paul and the Language of Scripture. Citation Technique in the Pauline Epistles and Contemporary Literature* (MSSNTS 69; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), pp. 206-207.

[4] The subjection of Jesus to God concurs, of course, with Jesus' handing over the kingdom to God as mentioned in verse 24b.

[5] It is generally agreed that the use of Ps. 110(109):1 for giving expression to the idea of Jesus' exaltation has a pre-Pauline origin; see D.M. Hay, *Glory at the Right Hand. Psalm 110 in Early Christianity* (SBL.MS 18; Nashville/New York: Abingdon Press, 1973); M.C. de Boer, 'Use', forthcoming.

[6] See the illustrative charts and appendices in D.M. Hay, *Glory, passim.*

There is only one true parallel to Paul's use in 1 Corinthians 15 of Ps. 110(109):1c; namely, Heb. 10:12-13.[1] In this passage, too, Jesus is presented as the one under whose feet all enemies will be subjected.

Just like Paul, the author of Hebrews argues with the help of Ps. 110(109):1c that the subjection of the enemies has already begun. After Jesus' self-sacrifice, 'he sat down at the right hand of God, and since then has been waiting until his enemies would be made a footstool for his feet' (Heb. 10:12-13). Another similarity between Paul's use of Ps. 110(109):1c and that by the author of Hebrews is that both authors combine Ps. 110(109):1 with Ps. 8:7 to emphasize that Jesus will rule over everything and everyone (πάντας; Heb. 1:13-2:9). This procedure, the combination of Ps. 8:7 and Ps. 110(109):1 to describe Jesus' rule over everything and everyone, is of pre-Pauline origin since it is also found in other, mutually independent writings contained in the New Testament.[2] The use of Ps. 110(109):1c to stress the idea that Jesus' lordship has already begun with his enthronement is not only found in Paul and Hebrews, but also in Mark 12:35-37 (κύριον) and Acts 2:34-35 (κύριον αὐτὸν ἐποίησεν ὁ θεός).

What distinguishes the idea of the subjection of the enemies in 1 Cor. 15:25-28 from the thought expressed in Heb. 1:13-2:9 and 10:12-13 is that, according to Paul, Jesus himself will complete the subjection of the hostile powers of which death is the last. In Heb. 1:13-2:9 and 10:12-13 Jesus is presented as remaining completely passive; moreover there is no mention of death as the last enemy.[3] The comparison with Hebrews shows clearly that Paul makes the defeat of death the climax of Jesus' activity as ruler on behalf of God. This defeat of death will not take place until the time of Jesus' second coming.

---

[1] In Mark 12:36 (par. Matt. 22:44, Luke 20:42-43), Acts 2:34-35, and Heb. 1:13 where Ps. 110(109):1c is also quoted, the idea of the subjection of the enemies has no function in the context. In these passages verse 1c is only quoted to give the quotation of Ps. 110(109):1 in full.

[2] See, e.g., Mark 12:36 ὑποκάτω, 1 Pet. 3:22, and Eph. 1:20-22; cf. D.M. Hay, *Glory*, pp. 128-129. See also M.C. de Boer, 'Use', forthcoming, who tries to reconstruct this pre-Pauline 'resurrection tradition'.

[3] Also, according to the author to the Hebrews, the victory over the devil, as the one who has the power over death, has already taken place, namely, through Jesus' death and resurrection (Heb. 2:14).

(3) The elimination or destruction[1] of death at the end of time is a traditional idea.[2] In verses 54-55 Paul refers to this tradition by quoting Isa. 25:8 in combination with Hos. 13:14. When everyone has put on immortality, either through resurrection or transformation, then death will be swallowed up into victory. Thus, in verses 54-55, the eschatological resurrection and the destruction of death are directly related to each other. The same relationship between the eschatological resurrection and the destruction of death is found in verses 20-28. Death is a cosmic power which entered into the world through Adam and reigns over everyone. Death will be overcome only through the resurrection or transformation at the end of time, when Jesus comes. Then death will be destroyed for ever. Although Paul speaks of two separate events, namely, first the resurrection (v. 23) and then the destruction of death (v. 26), there is a close relationship between the two events, even though they do not coincide. Again, Paul does not describe the eschatological events with the intention of giving a complete, systematic analysis of the last events.

(4) According to Paul in 1 Cor. 15:23-28, the future defeat of death will be the climax of Jesus' actions at the end of time. With the help of a traditional combination of Psalm quotations, the apostle sets out that the subjection of the enemies, which God is already bringing about and will carry to completion through Jesus, will be completed with the destruction of death. Death is presented here as a cosmic power, which can only be destroyed by Jesus at the end of time. Paul's emphasis on the future character of the destruction of death shows precisely what is wrong with the Corinthian view on spiritual immortality of the soul. Only at the end of time, when Jesus returns as God's eschatological agent, will death finally be overcome. When Jesus comes, those Christians who have died will be raised, those that are alive will be transformed, death will be destroyed for ever, and immortality and imperishability will be 'put on'.

---

[1] The verb καταργεῖν means literaly 'to render powerless, ineffective'; it is especially used by Paul for the annihilation of those realities which belong to the old aeon; M.C. de Boer, *Defeat*, p. 121; G. Münderlein, *Überwindung*, pp. 105-107.

[2] See, for instance, 4 Ezra 8:53; Bib. Ant. 3:10; cf. M.C. de Boer, *Defeat*, p. 136.

PART TWO

THE COINCIDENCE OF THE ESCHATOLOGICAL RESURRECTION AND JESUS' PAROUSIA

Part two of this study will offer a traditio-historical analysis of the idea that the eschatological resurrection will take place at the time of Jesus' second coming (1 Cor. 15:23). This analysis will lead to the heart of early Christian eschatology. It will be made clear how two central eschatological expectations, that of the future eschatological resurrection and that of Jesus' parousia, originated and how they became part of one scenario of the events at the end of time. Not only Paul's letters but also the two other main repositories of the earliest Christian traditions, the gospel according to Mark and the source Q, will be taken into consideration. These sources appear to be indispensable for examining the origin of early Christian eschatology. Chapter IV will offer an examination of all passages besides 1 Cor. 15:23 in which the idea is found that the eschatological resurrection will occur at the time of Jesus' parousia. Next, the two expectations connected in this idea will be analysed. In chapter V an examination of how the expectation of the eschatological resurrection arose among Christians will be conducted. Chapter VI will address the issue of how the expectation of Jesus' future coming originated. Then, in chapter VII, an attempt will be made to trace the origin of the idea that the eschatological resurrection will take place at the time of Jesus' second coming.

IV. THE IDEA OF THE ESCHATOLOGICAL RESURRECTION COINCIDING WITH JESUS' PAROUSIA

(1) In chapter I it was argued that Paul connected the eschatological resurrection to Jesus' coming from heaven (1 Cor. 15:23) because he wished to emphasize the future, eschatological character of the resurrection.[1] Christians will only be raised and receive immortality at the end of time, when Jesus returns from heaven. For that reason Paul continues by giving a short description of the events which will accompany Jesus' appearance. The apostle sketches an eschatological scenario in which the resurrection is related to other eschatological events, including Jesus' coming. In short, the idea in 1 Cor. 15:23 that the eschatological resurrection will take place at the time of Jesus' parousia is an essential element in Paul's argumentation.

(2) Within the Pauline letters there is only one other passage in which the expectation of the eschatological resurrection and that of Jesus' future coming are connected, namely 1 Thess. 4:16-17. In this passage Paul addresses the Thessalonians concerning their mourning over relatives who had died before Jesus' definitive coming. As already mentioned in the section on the history of research on 1 Corinthians 15, it is a debated issue whether or not the Thessalonians were already familiar with the expectation of the eschatological resurrection.[2] Did the Thessalonians mourn because they believed that the dead would remain dead and not share in the eternal glory, or did they mourn because they believed that the dead, although they would rise, would share in the eternal glory in a less perfect way than those alive at the time of Jesus' coming? In other words, does Paul inform the Thessalonians of something new, namely, the resurrection of the dead at the end of time, or is he trying to correct the Thessalonian view of the eschatological resurrection and the status of the dead to be raised?

Regardless of the position which one takes in this dispute,[3] it is clear that Paul in his reply explicitly relates the idea of the eschatological resurrection to that of Jesus' future coming in glory. Whether one ar-

---

[1] See chapter I, p. 38.

[2] See Introduction, pp. 23-26.

[3] It was already observed in the section on the history of research on 1 Corinthians 15 that the arguments in favour of either position seem to counterbalance each other.

gues that the Thessalonians did not yet know of the future resurrection, or that they feared that the dead, in spite of their future resurrection, would still be in a lower position than those alive at Jesus' coming, the fact remains that Paul, in his response to the Thessalonian problem, connects the eschatological resurrection to Jesus' parousia. He replies as follows: between Jesus' descent from heaven and the believers' ascent, the dead will be raised so that they can go up together with the living to meet the Lord in the air. Paul takes two independent ideas, the notion of a resurrection at the end of time and the notion of Jesus' coming from heaven, and integrates them together to form one scenario of the events of the last day.

It is unclear whether the Thessalonians were inadequately informed about Paul's view on the future resurrection, or not at all. With the idea of Jesus' coming in glory, however, they were fully acquainted. From other passages in 1 Thessalonians it is evident that they eagerly awaited Jesus' coming from heaven. When this event would take place, they expected to receive eternal salvation (1:10; 2:19; 3:13; 5:23). Yet, concerning the fate of the dead at the time of Jesus' appearance, they were either inadequately informed, or not informed at all. Therefore, Paul utilizes the Thessalonian belief in Jesus' coming and links the notion of the eschatological resurrection to the expectation of that coming. Thus, in 1 Thess. 4:16-17, just as in 1 Cor. 15:23, Paul connects the expectation of the future resurrection to that of Jesus' return in glory, because the combination of precisely these two ideas reinforces his argumentation.

The way in which Paul connects the notion of the eschatological resurrection to that of Jesus' parousia in 1 Thess. 4:13-18 deserves to be examined more closely. According to Paul, the final goal to be reached by the believers at the end of time is their glorious and eternal communion with Jesus. Jesus' coming will lead to their being with him or living with him (εἶναι or ζῆν σὺν αὐτῷ, 4:17; 5:10).[1] The resurrection of the dead at the end of time is presented as leading up to the same goal. In verse 14 Paul writes that 'through Jesus, God will bring with him (i.e. Jesus) those who have died.' The apostle fails to mention what one expects to find after the first half of verse 14; namely, that God will raise those who have fallen asleep just as he had raised Jesus.[2] Instead, Paul turns immediately to the final goal of the resurrection:

---

[1] For a further examination of this idea, see chapter XIV, pp. 198-202.

[2] For the construction of εἰ with the indicative, see BDR 372.1.

the dead will be brought (into communion) with Jesus.[1] The phrase ἄξει σὺν αὐτῷ in verse 14 refers to the communion between Jesus and his followers, the final goal of Jesus' coming (4:17; 5:10). According to Paul in verse 14, God will lead the dead into this community, too.[2]

Paul assumes in verse 14 that a resurrection must take place before the unity of the dead believers with Jesus can be accomplished. This assumption is worked out in the following verses. In verses 16-17 Paul explains that Jesus will first descend from heaven, then the dead will be raised and, finally, all will be caught up in the air to be with the Lord for ever. Thus, in verses 16-17 Paul combines the idea of a future resurrection with the notion of Jesus' coming at the end of time and presents them as belonging to one scenario of events.

(3) The examination of 1 Cor. 15:23 and 1 Thess. 4:16-17, the only two passages in Paul's letters where the expectations of the eschatological resurrection and Jesus' future coming are explicitly integrated, has shown that the connection between the two expectations is secondary. This conclusion is confirmed by the fact that in many passages Paul speaks about one of the two expected events without referring to the other. Apparently, the two concepts were not intrinsically related. Paul speaks about the eschatological resurrection in six passages[3] and about Jesus' coming in 21 passages,[4] but only twice, namely, in 1 Cor. 15:23 and 1 Thess. 4:16-17, are the two concepts connected to each other.[5]

One of the reasons why the two expectations are so rarely connected in Paul's letters, of course, is that Paul only seldom speaks about the last events in a more or less extensive or systematic way. Only in 1 Cor. 15:23-28 and 1 Thess. 4:16-17 does Paul give a succinct scenario of the events which will take place at the end of time. In all other pas-

---

[1] The phrase 'through Jesus' (διὰ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ) in verse 14 is a general reference to Jesus as the basis and the instrument of God's actions; see G. Lüdemann, *Paulus*, p. 239; T. Holtz, *Thessalonicher*, p. 193.

[2] B. Rigaux, *Saint Paul. Les épîtres aux Thessaloniciens* (EtB; Paris: J. Gabalda, Gembloux: J. Duculot, 1956), p. 537; P. Hoffmann, *Toten*, pp. 216-217; T. Holtz, *Thessalonicher*, pp. 191-193.

[3] These passages are 1 Thess. 4:16-17; 1 Cor. 6:14; 1 Corinthians 15; 2 Cor. 5:3; Rom. 6:5; 8:11. For a discussion of these passages, see chapter V, pp. 77-79.

[4] These passages are 1 Thess. 1:3, 10; 2:19; 3:13; 4:16-17; 5:1-4, 23; 1 Cor. 1:7-8; 3:12-15; 4:5; 5:5; 11:26; 15:23; 16:22; 2 Cor. 1:14; 5:10; Phil. 1:6, 10; 2:16; 3:20; Rom. 5:9. For a discussion of these passages, see chapter VI, pp. 95-99.

[5] It should perhaps be added that the combination of the ideas of Jesus' return and the believers' resurrection is probably presupposed in several passages on the last judgement, such as 2 Cor. 5:10 and Rom. 14:10. But neither Jesus' coming in the future, nor the resurrection of the believers, is mentioned in these verses.

sages in which the eschatological resurrection or Jesus' coming is mentioned, these events themselves are not the issue. On the contrary, Paul mostly touches on these themes indirectly, in a casual remark; not because he wants to treat their contents in detail.

Two possible exceptions, however, have to be mentioned: 2 Cor. 5:1-5 and Phil. 3:20-21. In these passages Paul treats the events of the end of time on a somewhat larger scale. Nevertheless, no connection is made in these passages between the expectation of the eschatological resurrection and that of Jesus' parousia. In 2 Cor. 5:1-5 Paul speaks about the new (eternal) life soon to be received. If the reception of this new life does not take place during Paul's lifetime through a transformation, then it will be received afterwards, through a resurrection. The acquisition of the new life is described as 'becoming over-clothed' (ἐπενδύσασθαι, v. 2), that is, receiving the garment of immortality while still living in the garment of mortality. This 'becoming over-clothed' must be the same event as what Paul calls 'being transformed' (ἀλλαγῆναι) in 1 Cor. 15:51-52; namely, the obtaining of eternal life by those believers who will still be alive at the moment of Jesus' parousia.[1] Paul strongly hopes that this will happen soon, yet, if it so happens that he will die before the new aeon breaks through, he is assured that he will participate in the life to come, for he 'will certainly not be found naked' (2 Cor. 5:3).

Verse 3 contains three major difficulties.[2] First of all, the reading ἐκδυσάμενοι (being unclothed, i.e., having died) is only found in a few manuscripts. Nonetheless, this reading is to be preferred to ἐνδυσάμενοι (being clothed) which is found in the majority of the manuscripts. The latter would make verse 3 tautologous: 'Since, even if clothed, we will certainly not be found naked.'[3] Furthermore, it is hard to imagine what 'being clothed' would mean in comparison to 'being over-clothed' (ἐπενδύσασθαι) which is mentioned in the preceding verse.[4] The reading ἐκλυσάμενοι which is found in a few manuscripts,

---

[1] Paul uses the clothing metaphor (ἐνδύσασθαι ἀφθαρσίαν) also in 1 Cor. 15:53.

[2] Cf. F.G. Lang, *2. Korinther 5,1-10 in der neueren Forschung* (BGBE 16; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1973).

[3] R. Bultmann, *Der zweite Brief an die Korinther* (KEK; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, edition by E. Dinkler, 1976), p. 137.

[4] M.E. Thrall sees the two (ἐπενδύσασθαι and ἐνδύσασθαι) as synonyms and regards verse 3 an explicit warning against the Corinthian opinion that life after death will be bodiless (γυμνός); M.E. Thrall, *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians* (ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1994), vol. I, pp. 377-379. However, in that case the second half of verse 3 would suffice and a conjunction such as ἀλλὰ μή would be more efficient. In addition, the fact that the idea of 'not being found naked' is dependent on a condition

also supports the authenticity of ἐκδυσάμενοι, for ἐκλυσάμενοι is more easily explained as a misreading of ἐκδυσάμενοι than of ἐνδυσάμενοι.

Secondly, the meaning of the phrase εἴ γε καί is sometimes considered to be a difficulty. However, if the reading ἐκδυσάμενοι is accepted, then the phrase εἴ γε καί is no longer problematical. The phrase εἴ γε introduces a statement of which the validity is beyond any doubt:[1] '*since*, even if unclothed, we will *certainly* not be found naked.' Καί qualifies the participle ἐκδυσάμενοι, to which it adds the concessive notion of 'even if (unclothed)'. Paul is absolutely convinced that if there will be an interval between his natural death and the coming of the new aeon, that is, an interval during which he is dead, or, in his own words, 'unclothed', he will turn out to be clothed when the new aeon breaks through as a result of the resurrection.

The meaning of 'naked' (γυμνός) is the third difficulty of verse 3. The adjective has to be understood, however, in the sense that someone who has died loses the clothing of his body.[2] The situation of being naked is that of having no body. Paul is alluding to the problem of whether someone who has no body can be resurrected. Having no body amounts almost to non-existence: is it possible for someone who has no body and who can hardly be said to exist, to be saved and raised at the end of time? For someone other than Paul this might be a problem. But Paul is convinced that even if he and other Christians should die before the end of time (ἐκδύσασθαι) and, as a consequence not be 'overclothed', they will nevertheless receive eternal life, the immortal garment; for eventually, they will certainly not be found naked.

Paul means that a person will be raised, that is, receive the immortal clothing through resurrection, even if he or she died before the end of time. As a result of the resurrection, such a person 'will not be found naked.' It must be admitted that a clear reference to the eschatological resurrection is missing in verse 3. Paul moves directly to the result of the resurrection; namely, to not being found naked but being clothed. However, only if one assumes that verse 3 includes some reference to the eschatological resurrection will the verse make sense.[3] Thus, Paul

---

(εἰ; see below) makes verse 3 incomprehensable in relation to verse 2 if the reading ἐνδυσάμενοι is accepted.

[1] See M.E. Thrall, *Greek Particles in the New Testament. Linguistic and Exegetical Studies* (NTTS 3; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1962), pp. 86-91; M.E. Thrall, *Corinthians*, vol. I, p. 376.

[2] Cf. H. Lietzmann, *Korinther*, p. 120; cf. 4 Ezra 2:45.

[3] Another passage where Paul also does not mention the eschatological resurrection, but moves directly to the result of resurrection, thereby presupposing the resurrection itself, is 1 Thess. 4:14. In this verse Paul states directly the result of being raised; namely,

takes the option of the resurrection into account, yet he himself hopes to be over-clothed, that is, to receive a new body before dying. Surprisingly, however, the idea of receiving new life, either through transformation or resurrection, is in no way linked here to the idea of Jesus' coming at the end of time.[1]

In Phil. 3:20-21 Paul speaks about the eternal salvation which is to be brought by Jesus at the end of time as the final goal to which the Christian life leads. Paul makes these statements in his exhortation to his readers to persevere in a Christian way of life, to remain his imitators and not to listen to the 'enemies of the cross' (v. 18). In a few phrases Paul pictures this final goal: Jesus will come down from heaven and transform the miserable life of the Christians into a glorious one resembling his own. He will subject everything to his power.[2] Whether the idea of the eschatological resurrection is included here in the idea of transformation is not clear. One could argue in the affirmative on the basis of 1 Cor. 15:51-52 and 2 Cor. 5:1-5,[3] but in the negation on the basis of Rom. 8:17 and 2 Cor. 3:18.[4] In any case, Paul does not explicitly state in Phil. 3:20-21 that people will be raised at Christ's coming from heaven. Paul merely speaks about the eternal salvation which is to be received through, and at the time of, Jesus' descent from

---

being led to the Lord, which obviously presupposes a preceding resurrection. This is clear from the verses which follow this passage (see pp. 70-71). Compare also 1 Cor. 15:51-52 where the transformation of the living into immortality and the resurrection of the dead are part of one and the same event.

[1] The nearest reference to Jesus' parousia is found in 5:10, where Jesus' coming is implied in the idea that all people will have to appear before Jesus' throne. Although it is not explicitly said that Jesus will first come down before this will happen, this must be assumed, especially in light of 1 Cor. 4:5. Nevertheless, Jesus' coming and subsequent judicial activity are not said to be connected with the believers' reception of the new life. Paul refers to Jesus' judicial activity merely to provide support for his paraenesis (vv. 6-9), as he does with many of his other references to Jesus' coming at the end of time; see, for instance, 2 Cor. 1:14; 1 Cor. 1:7-8; 1 Thess. 3:13; 5:23; Phil. 1:6, 10.

[2] The transformation of the weak, mortal bodies is part of Jesus' act of subjecting everything to his power; see chapter VI, p. 97.

[3] Another argument often adduced in favour of the view that a resurrection is included in the idea of transformation in Phil. 3:20-21 is Phil. 3:10-11, where comparable language is used (συμμορφίζεσθαι, 3:10; cf. σύμμορφος, 3:21). However, in 3:10-11 Paul is speaking about his own martyrological resurrection which was expected to take place soon after the martyr's death, and not about the eschatological resurrection; see chapter IX, pp. 153-155.

[4] See, for instance, J. Gnilka, *Der Philipperbrief* (HBK; Freiburg/Basel/Wien: Herder, 1968), p. 209; E. Lohmeyer, *Die Briefe an die Philipper, an die Kolosser und an Philemon* (KEK; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1953), p. 259; cf. chapter XI, pp. 167-169.

heaven. Accordingly, he does not explicitly refer to the eschatological resurrection.

It may be concluded that 2 Cor. 5:1-5 and Phil. 3:20-21, too, show that the two expectations, that of the eschatological resurrection and that of Jesus' coming in glory, were not always related. In 2 Cor. 5:1-5 Paul speaks about salvation and resurrection without mentioning Jesus' coming; in Phil. 3:20-21 he speaks about salvation and Jesus' descent from heaven without mentioning the eschatological resurrection. The conclusion that the relationship between the eschatological resurrection and Jesus' coming in the future in 1 Cor. 15:23 and 1 Thess. 4:16-17 is secondary, is hereby further sustained.

(4) In the gospel according to Mark and the source Q, both the expectation of the eschatological resurrection[1] and that of Jesus' coming at the end of time[2] are found, but the two expectations are never connected. Particularly striking in this respect is Mark's account of Jesus' discussion with the Sadducees on the issue of the eschatological resurrection (Mark 12:18-27). In this discussion there is no reference whatsoever to the coming of the Son of Man (Jesus). Furthermore, in Mark 13:26-27, the most important passage in Mark on Jesus' coming at the end of time, the author does not mention a resurrection of believers who have died, but only the gathering of the elect.

In the later writings of the New Testament the two concepts are only rarely related to each other.[3] In several passages in the gospel of John where the author makes Jesus say that he will raise the believers (ἀναστήσω) on the last day (τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ),[4] there seems to be a relationship between Jesus' coming at the end of time and the eschatological resurrection. It must be assumed, in that case, that the author of the gospel of John did expect Jesus' return from heaven on the last day. There are a number of statements in John supporting this inference.[5]

---

[1] Mark 12:18-27 (cf. 9:1); Matt. 11:4-5/Luke 7:22; Matt. 12:41-42/Luke 11:31-32 (cf. Matt. 11:21-23/Luke 10:13-15; Matt. 19:28/Luke 22:30; Matt. 8:11/Luke 13:28); for an examination of these passages, see chapter V, pp. 79-85.

[2] Mark 8:38; 13:26; 14:62; Matt. 24:44/Luke 12:40; Matt. 23:39/Luke 13:35; Matt. 24:27, 37, 39/Luke 17:24, 26, 30 (cf. Matt. 10:32/Luke 12:8; Matt. 19:28/Luke 22:30); for an examination of these passages, see chapter VI, pp. 99-102.

[3] Passages on the eschatological resurrection: Luke 14:14; Acts 24:15, 21; 2 Tim. 2:18; Heb. 6:2; 11:35; Rev. 20:4-6, 12-13. Passages on Jesus' coming at the end of time: 2 Thess. 2:1-2, 8; Jas. 5:7-8; 2 Pet. 1:16; 3:1-13; 1 John 2:28.

[4] John 6:39, 40, 44, 54; cf. 5:21-29.

[5] See John 11:52; 14:3; 21:22-23; cf. M. de Jonge, 'The Radical Eschatology of the Fourth Gospel and the Eschatology of the Synoptics', in: A. Denaux (ed.), *John and the Synoptics* (BEThL 101; Leuven: University Press/Peeters, 1992), pp. 481-487.

Yet, the author of John puts more emphasis on Jesus' return in terms of the sending of the Spirit (14:16-28). That is to say, in the author's view Jesus had already returned to the community in the Spirit. True, the author seems to reckon with a future presence of Jesus with the believers, but he emphasizes the already realized return of Jesus through the Spirit.[1] Therefore, if one regards the phrase 'on the last day' in John 6:39-54 as referring to Jesus' actual coming from heaven at the end of time, as seems plausible, a relationship between the eschatological resurrection and Jesus' parousia is at least presupposed in this passage. This passage in John seems to be the only instance of the connection between the future resurrection and Jesus' coming in the writings of the New Testament outside the Pauline epistles.

(5) The idea that the eschatological resurrection will take place at the moment of Jesus' coming in the future is only attested twice in the literature of early Christianity; namely, in 1 Cor. 15:23 and in 1 Thess. 4:16-17.[2] In these passages Paul connects the two ideas because misconceptions on the part of his addressees force him to do so. Although in the source Q and the gospel according to Mark the expectation of the eschatological resurrection and that of Jesus' parousia are frequently mentioned, the two are never connected to each other. The conclusion must be, therefore, that Paul is the first who explicitly connected these two expectations.

---

[1] See M. de Jonge, 'Christology and Theology in the Context of Early Christian Eschatology, particularly in the Fourth Gospel', in: F. Van Segbroeck, C.M. Tuckett, G. Van Belle, J. Verheyden (eds.), *The Four Gospels 1992* (FS F. Neirynck; BEThL 100; Leuven: University Press/Peeters, 1992), vol. III, pp. 1835-1853. The eschatological resurrection (11:24 and 11:25-26) and the final judgement (12:48 and 3:16-21) are also presented as both in the future and already realized (see also 5:24-29).

[2] But see the passages and comments on 2 Cor. 5:1-5, 10 and Phil. 3:20-21 above, pp. 68-75.

V. THE CHRISTIAN EXPECTATION OF THE ESCHATOLOGICAL RESURRECTION

It is common knowledge that the Christian expectation of the eschatological resurrection stems from Judaism. Generally speaking this view is correct. Within first century C.E. Judaism, however, there was not one, unequivocal concept of the eschatological resurrection. There existed many concepts of resurrection and numerous ideas about what would be the fate of the dead. Some were convinced that there would be no life after death at all. Therefore, the thesis that the Christian belief in the eschatological resurrection derives from Jewish tradition needs specification. First, in section a, the earliest traceable Christian concept of the eschatological resurrection will be examined; the concept as it is found in Paul, the gospel according to Mark, and the source Q. In section b, the Jewish tradition from which the Christian concept of the eschatological resurrection stems will be identified. Finally, in section c, the rise of the Christian expectation of the eschatological resurrection will be elucidated.

a. *The earliest traceable Christian concept of the eschatological resurrection*

(1) The most important passages on the eschatological resurrection in Paul's letters have already been examined in previous chapters. The concept of the eschatological resurrection found in the three remaining Pauline passages on the eschatological resurrection, 1 Cor. 6:14, Rom. 6:5, and Rom. 8:11,[1] corresponds to that found in the passages earlier examined.

In 1 Cor. 6:14 Paul speaks about the eschatological resurrection in the context of several comments which he makes on the resurrection of the body. The reference to the bodily nature of the resurrection is

---

[1] 2 Cor. 4:14 and 13:4 need not be examined here since in these passages Paul does not speak about the eschatological resurrection. Instead, as will be argued in chapter XIV, pp. 190-194, Paul speaks in these passages about resurrection in a metaphorical way. Phil. 3:10-11 does not need to be taken into consideration either, since in this passage Paul speaks about his own resurrection which he expects to be a martyrological resurrection, i.e., an individual resurrection soon after his violent death, not at the end of time; see chapter IX, pp. 153-155, chapter XI, p. 173.

Paul's first argument in his plea to keep the body in honour. This plea is a reaction to the dubious sexual behaviour of some of the Corinthian Christians. 'The body is meant not for fornication but for the Lord, ... and God raised the Lord and will also raise us by his power' (vv. 13-14). In other words, because the body will be raised, one should not defile it through fornication. But the reference to the resurrection of the body is just one of Paul's arguments against fornication.[1] In light of the fact that some of the Corinthians had difficulties with a bodily resurrection, as appears in 1 Corinthians 15,[2] this argument can hardly have been very effective.[3] Nevertheless, it shows that Paul expected the eschatological resurrection to be of a bodily nature.[4]

In Rom. 6:5 the eschatological resurrection is mentioned as the final reward which Christians will receive as a result of their baptism. Baptism symbolizes the start of their unification with Jesus' death. This unification will eventually result in a unity with Jesus' resurrection in the future: 'For if we have been united with him in a death like his, we will certainly be united with him in a resurrection like his' (v. 5; cf. v. 8). The future unity with Jesus' resurrection, in contradistinction to the unity with Jesus' resurrection which has already been realized through baptism, is a unity which will be established at the end of time, on the last day.[5] This resurrection with Christ will be part of the definitive salvation.

Paul speaks about the eschatological resurrection in a similar way in Rom. 8:11. Here he explains how Christians live through the Spirit (8:1-17) and how they will be raised through the Spirit at the end of time: 'If the Spirit of him who raised Jesus from the dead dwells in you, he who raised Christ from the dead will give life to your mortal bodies also through his Spirit that dwells in you.' The eschatological resurrection is not the topic of the pericope, but it is simply spoken of,

---

[1] Cf. H. Conzelmann, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther* (KEK; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, [2]1981), p. 141.

[2] Supposing the Corinthians addressed in chapter 15 are the same as those addressed in 6:14.

[3] Paul's further arguments are more felicitous: Christians are part of the body of Christ (vv. 15-18) and the body is a temple of the Holy Sprit (v. 19); see also chapter XI, pp. 172-173.

[4] Cf. G.D. Fee, *Corinthians*, pp. 255-257.

[5] The future tenses (ἐσόμεθα, v. 5; συζήσομεν, v. 8) refer to the eschatological future, the last day, and not to the situation immediately following baptism; E. Käsemann, *An die Römer* (HNT; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], [3]1974), p. 161; U. Wilckens, *Der Brief an die Römer* (EKK; Zürich: Benziger Verlag, Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1980), vol. II, pp. 15-16. For a more detailed exegesis of Rom. 6:5, 8, see chapter XI, pp. 169-171, cf. chapter XIV, pp. 189-190.

almost in passing, as the final result of the Christians' living through the Spirit. Again one notices that in Paul's view the eschatological resurrection is bodily: mortal bodies (τὰ θνητὰ σώματα) will be brought to life (ζῳοποιηθῆναι).[1]

The Pauline concept of the eschatological resurrection is simple and clear. At the end of time, at the moment of Jesus' descent from heaven, the dead will be raised. This resurrection will be bodily, although the body received will be of a spiritual, imperishable substance. Such a heavenly body or garment will also be received by those who are alive at the time of the resurrection.[2]

Paul does not speak about a resurrection of non-Christians, yet he does not state that non-Christians will not be raised, either. Since Paul explicitly addresses Christians in his letters, there is no reason for him to speak about the fate of non-Christians. As a result, he is also silent about a possible resurrection of non-Christians. It can be argued, however, that in Paul's view the final judgement is a general judgement. It will be a judgement of all people, good and evil, Christians and non-Christians (Rom. 2:5-12; 3:6; 1 Cor. 5:13; 6:2; 2 Cor. 11:15; Phil. 1:28).[3] If Paul *did* reckon with a general last judgement, it may be assumed that he also reckoned with a general resurrection.[4] The relationship between judgement and resurrection is traditional: people are raised in order to be judged.[5]

(2) The author of Mark speaks about the eschatological resurrection, both implicitly and explicitly, in two passages: Mark 9:1 and 12:18-27. In Mark 9:1 the author portrays Jesus as saying: 'Truly I tell you, there are some standing here who will not taste death until they see that the kingdom of God has come with power.' It is evident that this saying was composed, or at least edited, in this form in order to justify the delay of the definitive coming of the kingdom of God.[6] The author as-

---

[1] For a more detailed examination of Rom. 8:11, see chapter XI, pp. 167-169.

[2] See 1 Cor. 15:51-52; Phil. 3:21.

[3] Cf. H. Lietzmann, *Korinther*, p. 122; R.P. Martin, *2 Corinthians* (WBC; Waco: Word Books, 1986), p. 115.

[4] See H. Molitor, *Auferstehung*, *passim*.

[5] See, for instance, Dan. 12:2; 4 Ezra 7:32-44; Bib. Ant. 3:10; 1 Enoch 51:1-5; Sib. Or. 4:181-183; cf. P. Volz, *Die Eschatologie der jüdischen Gemeinde im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], ²1934), pp. 225-256; W. Bousset, *Die Religion des Judentums im späthellenistischen Zeitalter* (HNT 21; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 3rd edition by H. Gressmann, 1926), p. 270; see also chapter VII, pp. 125-127.

[6] See E. Grässer, *Parusieverzögerung*, pp. 131-137; J. Gnilka, *Das Evangelium nach Markus* (EKK; Zürich: Benzinger Verlag, Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag,

sures his readers that the definitive coming of the kingdom is so near that at least some of the people who were eyewitnesses of the ministry of the historical Jesus will not die before the kingdom has come in full. Apparently, some of those who had known Jesus personally had died in the meantime. Despite their death, the author explains, the promise that the end of time will come soon still stands. Obviously, Mark was being confronted, just like Paul, with the fact that Christians were dying before Jesus' coming in glory. The problem which these deaths had provoked in the Christian community of Thessalonica was uncertainty about the fate of the dead. However, the problem in the community of Mark was different. In Mark's situation the deaths of believers made people doubt the imminence of the kingdom of God. It is Mark's presupposition that those who had died will be raised at the end of time.

In Mark 12:18-27 the author relates the account of a discussion on the resurrection between Jesus and the Sadducees. The discussion is focused on the question of whether there will be such a life through resurrection at all.[1] Jesus answers by arguing that, since God is the God of the living, whereas he is also called the God of the patriarchs, the patriarchs must necessarily be alive.[2] It is assumed in this answer that the patriarchs had received a renewed life through a resurrection, for this was the point of the discussion.[3] From the fact that some (of the patriarchs) have been raised, the conclusion is drawn that others will be raised as well; namely, through the resurrection at the end of time.[4]

1979), vol. II, p. 26; D. Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium* (HNT; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1987), p. 153.

[1] In the course of the discussion it appears that, for the Sadducees, life after death is unimaginable since in their view it is incompatible with life on earth. The consequences of the marital laws as followed on earth would lead to insurmountable problems in a life after death. This was one of their reasons, according to Mark, to reject every form of after-life, including the idea of the eschatological resurrection. The Sadducean rejection of life after death and resurrection is also attested by the author of Acts (23:8) and Josephus (*Ant. Jud.* XVIII, 16; *Bell. Jud.* II, 165).

[2] The idea that the patriarchs were not dead but alive is traditional; see 1 Enoch 70:4; cf. 4 Macc. 7:18-19; 16:25; Philo, *Sac.* 5-6. See further P. Volz, *Eschatologie*, pp. 236, 267-268.

[3] E. Lohmeyer, *Das Evangelium des Markus* (KEK; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1951), pp. 256-257.

[4] The resemblance to the way Paul tries to prove the reality of the eschatological resurrection in 1 Cor. 15:12-19 is striking. Both Paul and Mark use the resurrection of an individual or of several individuals as argument for the future reality of the eschatological resurrection. Just like the resurrection of Jesus, the resurrections of the patriarchs, as presented in biblical and post-biblical tradition, must be considered to be isolated incidents. That is, the patriarchs had been raised directly after dying as a special reward for what they had done (cf. 4 Macc. 7:18-19; 16:25, where the martyrs and the patriarchs are placed on one line). A similar argumentation for proving that there will be an escha-

With regard to the nature of the life which those who will be raised will receive, Jesus replies that it will be an angelic existence.[1] Furthermore, in the hereafter people will not live according to earthly laws, but heavenly laws; that is, there will be no marriage. Although the author of Mark does not offer more information about the angelic, heavenly post-resurrection form of existence, his ideas on this subject correspond to those of Paul. Paul, too, speaks about the after-life as something 'heavenly' (1 Cor. 15:47-49), although he is more focused on the actual form of this heavenly after-life.

(3) The expectation of the eschatological resurrection is also attested in the source Q, especially in relation to the idea of the last judgement. In Matt. 12:38-42/Luke 11:29-32 it is reported how Jesus is asked to perform a sign in order to prove his divine mission. Jesus reacts by saying that the question reveals the unbelief of those who ask it. He himself is already a sign, a sign like Jonah was, but they do not recognize it. Jesus continues by predicting the eternal punishment of those who have asked for a sign: 'The people of Nineveh will rise up at the judgement (ἀναστήσονται ἐν τῇ κρίσει) with this generation and condemn it, because they repented at the proclamation of Jonah, and see, something greater than Jonah is here!' (Matt. 12:41/Luke 11:32).[2] The idea here is that the unrighteous generation of Jesus' time will be convicted by the righteous generations of former times, since the latter repented and believed while Jesus' generation did not.[3] In order to judge, the people

---

tological resurrection can be found in rabbinic literature. There, the trustworthiness of the tradition according to which a resurrection will take place at the end of time is substantiated by referring to the raising of dead people by, e.g., Elijah and Elisha; H.L. Strack, P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch* (München: Oskar Beck, 1922), vol. I, pp. 893-895. See also the examination of Matt. 8:11/Luke 13:28 below.

[1] The idea that in the hereafter righteous ones will live like angels is Jewish tradition; see, for instance, 1 Enoch 51:4; 104:6; 2 Apoc. Bar. 51:5, 10; cf. P. Volz, *Eschatologie*, pp. 396-401.

[2] Not only the people of Nineveh, but also 'the queen of the South will rise at the judgement with the people of this generation and condemn them' (Matt. 12:42/Luke 11:31). In Luke, the saying about the resurrection of the queen of the South is recorded first and then that about the resurrection of the people of Nineveh. Matthew has the reverse order, which is probably less original. Matthew probably wanted to connect the saying about the resurrection of the people of Nineveh more closely to Jesus' answer regarding the sign of Jonah; S. Schulz, *Q. Die Spruchquelle der Evangelisten* (Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1972), pp. 251-252; I.H. Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke. A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Exeter: Paternoster, 1978), p. 482.

[3] The idea that the righteous ones will judge the unrighteous ones is traditional; see the passages listed in J. Tromp, *The Assumption of Moses. A Critical Edition with Com-*

of Nineveh will rise (ἀναστήσονται),[1] i.e., they will share in the eschatological resurrection.[2] The relationship assumed here between resurrection and judgement is traditional: it is often said that people will be raised to be judged.[3] The author's point of interest here is not the coming eschatological resurrection nor the coming judgement *per se*, but the fact that people have heard the gospel and have seen Jesus' miracles, yet still do not believe. More precisely, the author wants to say that certain Jews do not repent, whereas gentiles would, and probably did, repent.[4]

In the passage on the sign of Jonah it is not explicitly stated that both righteous and unrighteous ones will be raised. From other passages in Q concerning the last judgement, however, it is clear that the author believed that the final judgement would be a judgement of all people. For this reason the author must also have expected the resurrection preceding the judgement to be a general resurrection. In Matt. 11:21-23/Luke 10:13-15 the cities of Chorazin and Bethsaida are cursed for their unbelief, despite the 'deeds of power' which have been performed there. Even Tyre and Sidon, notorious for their unbelief in earlier times,[5] would have repented if the same deeds had been executed for them. Therefore, Jesus predicts, 'at the judgement (ἐν ἡμέρᾳ κρίσεως Matt./ ἐν τῇ κρίσει Luke) it will be more tolerable for Tyre and Sidon than for you' (i.e., Chorazin and Bethsaida).[6] The combination of resurrection and judgement found in Matt. 12:38-42/Luke 11:29-32 recurs in this saying.[7] On the day of judgement the sinful people of Tyre and Sidon of past generations will rise and be judged. They will be punished for their evil deeds, but the people of Chorazin and Bethsaida will be punished more severely. Thus, according to the author of Q, the judgement at the end of time will be a general judgement; the righteous and unrighteous ones of all generations will be judged. Consequently, this judgement must be preceded by a general resurrection.

---

mentary (SVTP 10; Leiden/New York/Köln: E.J. Brill, 1993), p. 231; cf. U. Luz, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus* (EKK; Zürich: Benzinger Verlag, Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1990), vol. II, p. 280.

[1] The verb describing the resurrection of the queen of the South is ἐγείρεσθαι (ἐγερθήσεται).

[2] S. Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, p. 257; I.H. Marshall, *Luke*, p. 486.

[3] For the relationship between judgement and resurrection, see pp. 79, 125-127.

[4] The saying seems to legitimize a successful mission to the gentiles by contrasting it with a less successful one to the Jews (see below); cf. I.H. Marshall, *Luke*, p. 483.

[5] See, for instance, Isaiah 23; Ezekiel 26-28; cf. S. Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, p. 364.

[6] In addition, the town of Capernaum is cursed for its unbelief (Matt. 11:23/Luke 10:15).

[7] S. Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, p. 365.

In Matt. 19:28/Luke 22:30 it is predicted that in the new aeon Israel will be restored and will be governed by the Son of Man and his disciples. Although a coming resurrection is not explicitly mentioned in this passage, it must be presupposed. The author reports that Jesus promises his disciples that they will 'sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel.' The idea presented here is that in the new aeon Israel and its tribes will be restored[1] and ruled by the Son of Man and his disciples.[2] The idea of a restored Israel presupposes a preceding resurrection so that all the righteous of Israel can participate in this glory.[3] The eschatological glory implies a restoration of the twelve tribes of Israel: the righteous of Israel who are dispersed throughout the whole world, including those who have died, will return to Israel.

Besides these passages on resurrection and judgement there are two more passages in Q in which the expectation of the eschatological resurrection is attested. When the disciples of John the Baptist ask Jesus whether or not he is the long expected one, Jesus answers by pointing at the eschatological blessings which can already be observed: 'The blind receive their sight, the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, the deaf hear, the dead are raised (νεκροὶ ἐγείρονται), the poor have good news brought to them' (Matt. 11:4-5/Luke 7:22). The blessings enumerated here correspond to promises of salvation given in various passages of Isaiah. The fulfilment of Isaiah's predictions should lead the disciples of John to the conclusion that Jesus is indeed the long awaited one. The resurrection of the dead is presented here as one of the blessings belonging to the eschatological salvation prophesied in Isa. 26:19. Some of these blessings have already been (partly) realized by Jesus, as the author of Q reports; others are still to be realized in the near future. In the source Q, in contrast to the gospels of Matthew and Luke, Jesus is not reported to have raised deceased people.[4] Obviously, the resurrection of people who have died is supposed to take place very soon. But, from the healings which Jesus has already accomplished, it can be inferred that the eschatological time of salvation has already

---

[1] The idea of the restoration of Israel and its tribes in the new aeon is of course traditional. See, for instance, Ps. Sol. 17:26-28; cf. P. Volz, *Eschatologie*, pp. 368-381.

[2] See S. Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, pp. 335-336; E. Klostermann, *Das Matthäusevangelium* (HNT; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], ²1927), pp. 158-159.

[3] The author of Matthew makes the presupposed resurrection explicit by using the word παλιγγενεσία. Cf. Josephus, *Cont. Ap.* II, 218, δέδωκεν ὁ θεὸς γενέσθαι τε πάλιν καὶ ἀμείνω λαβεῖν ἐκ περιτροπῆς. Compare also Matt. 8:11/Luke 13:28 where the idea of a restored Israel and a preceding resurrection occur as well (the passage is examined below).

[4] Reports about Jesus healing lepers are also not found in the source Q.

started.[1] Although narrated in the present tense (ἐγείρονται), the miracle of the dead being raised was still outstanding. But Jesus had inaugurated the new aeon and the resurrection could now be expected to take place before long.[2]

A last passage in Q which reflects, at least indirectly, the expectation of the eschatological resurrection is Matt. 8:11-12/Luke 13:28-29. Here Jesus promises that those who follow him will be with 'Abraham and Isaac and Jacob and all the prophets in the kingdom of God.' Furthermore, people from all over the world, presumably including the gentile nations, will be gathered there as well and will participate in the eternal glory (Matt. 8:11/Luke 13:29).[3] The patriarchs figure here as the representatives of all Israel.[4] This means that this passage, too, is based on the tradition of the eschatological expectation of Israel's restoration. This restoration presupposes a resurrection of those righteous Israelites who have died.[5] As was demonstrated above, the same turned out to be true for the concept of Israel's restoration in Matt. 19:28/Luke 22:30. There, too, the supposition appeared to be that the righteous ones of Israel who have died, will rise to witness Israel's glory. The hypothesis that Matt. 8:11-12/Luke 13:28-29 presupposes a resurrection preceding the restoration of Israel is sustained by the reference to the patriarchs already present in God's kingdom. One must assume that the patriarchs owe their position in the kingdom to their resurrection.[6] According to the author of Q, then, Israel will be restored at the end of time, and the gentile nations will participate in the eschatological glory. Thus, in the eyes of the author of Q, the salvation

---

[1] G.R. Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and the Kingdom of God* (Grand Rapids: Wm.B. Eerdmans, Exeter: Paternoster, 1986), p. 82; I.H. Marshall, *Luke*, p. 292.

[2] For this futuristic use of the present tense, see BDR 323; J.H. Moulton et alii, *Grammar*, vol. III, p. 63; cf. καταργεῖται in 1 Cor. 15:26.

[3] The idea of the gathering of the nations and their participation in the eternal glory corresponds to a prophecy which occurs repeatedly in Isaiah; see, for instance, Isa. 2:2-3; 25:6-7; 56:6-7; see also Tob. 13:11; 14:6-7. The idea that there will be a banquet in the hereafter, the so-called messianic banquet, is also a Jewish tradition; see, for instance, 1 Enoch 62:14; 2 Apoc. Bar. 29:4-8; cf. P. Volz, *Eschatologie*, pp. 367-368; J. Priest, 'A Note on the Messianic Banquet', in: J.H. Charlesworth (ed., with J. Brownson, M.T. Davis, S.J. Kraftchick, A.F. Segal), *The Messiah. Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992), pp. 222-238. The supposition that the tradition of the gathering of the nations forms the background of Matt. 8:11/Luke 13:29 is supported by the sayings about the mission to the gentiles in Q (Matt. 12:38-42/Luke 11:29-32; Matt. 11:21-23/Luke 10:13-15); S. Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, pp. 326-327.

[4] G.R. Beasley-Murray, *Kingdom*, p. 173; S. Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, p. 327.

[5] S. Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, p. 327; I.H. Marshall, *Luke*, p. 567.

[6] See the examination of Mark 12:18-27 above.

to come is universal. It will be enjoyed by all righteous ones, Jews and gentiles, dead and alive.

The concept of the eschatological resurrection in the source Q does not differ from that found in Mark or Paul, although each author emphasizes different aspects. In Q the idea of a resurrection at the end of time is indissolubly connected with the idea of the final judgement. Furthermore, the author of Q emphasizes that all people will be raised in order to be judged. The author of Q does not differ from Mark or Paul in that he thinks that at the eschatological resurrection those rising will receive bodies. This is evident from the fact that he represents the eternal bliss as a banquet. It is also clear from his view that those raised will recognize the patriarchs (Matt. 8:11-12/Luke 13:28-29).

(4) Despite different accents, the three earliest Christian sources offer the same concept of the eschatological resurrection: the resurrection will take place at the end of time, it will be bodily, and it will be followed by the last judgement. All people, righteous and unrighteous, will be raised.

b. *The Jewish tradition of the eschatological resurrection*

As already stated, there is an almost absolute consensus among scholars as to the origin of the Christian expectation of the bodily eschatological resurrection: it was taken over from Jewish tradition. But the identification of the specific tradition in contemporary Judaism to which the Christian expectation in question has to be traced back, requires the greatest caution. In fact, the Jewish expectation of the bodily resurrection at the end of time is just one of the many views on life after death which was current in first century C.E. Judaism. In the Jewish literature of this period one finds various ideas on immortality, many diverging views on the state of being after death, and even many concepts of resurrection.[1] Not all of these ideas can be considered as

[1] Besides the concept of a bodily resurrection at the end of time, there is, for instance, the idea of (the soul) receiving a new (different) body on the last day (Josephus, *Bell. Jud.* II, 163; III, 374). Also frequently found is the idea that the souls of the dead are kept in storehouses until the day of resurrection (1 Enoch 22; 4 Ezra 7:32). At times it is said that only the souls will rise (1 Enoch 102:4-5; 103:3-4). One also finds the idea that the souls will live on immortally directly after death (Josephus, *Bell. Jud.* II, 154-158). Often two or more concepts are mixed (Ps.-Phoc. 97-115). The literature on the Jewish ideas on life after death includes: P. Volz, *Eschatologie*, pp. 229-272; D.S. Russell, *The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic 200 B.C - A.D. 100* (London: SCM Press,

forming the tradition from which the Christian expectation of the eschatological resurrection stems. This Christian expectation concurs with one particular Jewish view on after-life; namely, the view of the bodily resurrection at the end of time.

The heuristic principle which should direct one's search for the Jewish tradition from which the Christian expectation of the bodily resurrection derives, is the agreement in terminology and concepts on both sides, Christian and Jewish. Otherwise, one runs the risk of getting lost in the innumerable ideas on life after death which can be found in first century C.E. Judaism. Long lists of passages reflecting only distantly related ideas are of little use.

A quick examination of the language and concepts in which the Christian expectation of the bodily resurrection comes to expression, shows that the following phrases and notions are of interest. Those who will rise are 'the dead' (οἱ νεκροί)[1], deceased people (dead bodies), those who are said 'to sleep' (οἱ κοιμηθέντες).[2] These dead will 'rise' (ἀναστήσονται, ἐγερθήσονται),[3] or 'be made alive' (ζῳοποιηθήσονται).[4] This will be done by God; he will raise them or make them alive.[5] The new or renewed life they will receive will be an eternal and glorious life; that is, their body will be 'immortal' and 'imperishable' (ἀθάνατος, ἄφθαρτος), even 'spiritual' (πνευματικός), 'heavenly' (ἐπουράνιος), and 'angelic' (ὡς ἄγγελοι).[6] The people raised will include Christians as well as non-Christians. The resurrection will be followed by the last judgement.[7]

1964), pp. 353-390; P. Hoffmann, *Toten*, pp. 26-174; G.W.E. Nickelsburg, *Resurrection, Immortality and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism* (HThS 26; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1972); G. Stemberger, *Der Leib der Auferstehung. Studien zur Anthropologie und Eschatologie des palästinischen Judentums im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter (ca. 170 v.Chr. - 100 n.Chr.)* (AnBib 56; Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1972); H.C.C. Cavallin, *Life after Death, passim*; E. Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.- A.D. 135)* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, a new English version revised and edited by G. Vermes, F. Millar, M. Black, 1979), vol. II, pp. 539-544; E. Puech, *La croyance des Esséniens en la vie future: immortalité, résurrection, vie eternelle? Histoire d'une croyance dans le Judaïsme ancien* (EtB 22 n.s.; Paris: J. Gabalda, 1993).

[1] 1 Thess. 4:16; 1 Cor. 15:13, 15, 16, 21; Mark 12:25-26; cf. Rom. 4:17.

[2] 1 Thess. 4:13, 15; 1 Cor. 15:18, 20.

[3] 1 Thess. 4:16; Mark 12:26; Matt. 12:41-42/Luke 11:31-32.

[4] 1 Cor. 15:22.

[5] 1 Cor. 6:14; Rom. 8:11; cf. 2 Cor. 1:9; Rom. 4:17.

[6] 1 Cor. 15:44, 47, 52-54; 2 Cor. 5:1; Mark 12:25.

[7] Matt. 11:21-23/Luke 10:13-15; Matt. 12:38-42/Luke 11:29-32.

Passages on the bodily resurrection in Jewish literature[1] which are phrased in language similar to that used in the earliest Christian sources include: Dan. 12:2; Job 42:17(LXX); 1 Enoch 91:10; 4Q385, frg. 2, 5-8; 4Q521, frg. 2 ii, 12; frg. 7 ii, 6; Ps. Sol. 3:12; 1 Enoch 51:1-5; Sib. Or. 4:181-182; 2 Apoc. Bar. 21:23-24; 30:1-2; 42:7-8; 50:2-4; 4 Ezra 7:32; Apoc. Mos. 13:3 (according to some manuscripts);[2] 41:2 (10:2; 28:4); Bib. Ant. 3:10; and T. Job 4:9. These passages represent the tradition of the bodily eschatological resurrection from which the corresponding Christian expectation stems. They will be examined more fully in chapter VII. In 1 Cor. 15:23 and 1 Thess. 4:16-17 the resurrection of the dead is connected with the intervention of God's eschatological agent. In chapter VII the analysis will seek to discover which of the Jewish passages just mentioned shows a similar connection of resurrection and intervention of God's agent.

c. *The rise of the Christian expectation of the eschatological resurrection*

(1) The expectation of the eschatological resurrection was taken over from Judaism. It remains to be seen *when* this happened. As already mentioned in the review of the literature on this issue,[3] there are basically two options. Either (a) the eschatological resurrection belonged to the ideas of the Christian movement from the beginning, that is, from the time of Jesus' terrestrial activity, or (b) the expectation of the resurrection became part of Christian belief from the time when Christians began to die. The latter position is oftentimes argued on the basis of Paul's letter to the Thessalonians which shows, according to many scholars, that the Thessalonians were suddenly confronted with an unforeseen situation; namely, the dying of Christians before the end of time.[4] Whether or not one accepts the view that the Thessalonians were unfamiliar with the expectation of the eschatological resurrection, there is sufficient ground to assume that the expectation of the eschatological resurrection was already part of the Christian tradition before Paul wrote his letter to the Thessalonians. It can even be argued that

---

[1] The literature reviewed stems from the period from 300 B.C.E. to 100 C.E.

[2] M. Nagel, *La vie grecque d'Adam et d'Eve. Apocalypse de Moïse* (Ph.D. diss., Strasbourg, 1972), vol. III, p. 85.

[3] See Introduction, pp. 22-23.

[4] See Introduction, pp. 23-24.

this expectation belonged to the belief of Jesus' followers from the time before his death.

In his reply to the mourning Thessalonians Paul draws on traditional material which comes, he claims, from the Lord (Jesus) himself (1 Thess. 4:15). Although it is not entirely clear what the precise content of the 'word of the Lord' is,[1] nor from what kind of source it is derived,[2] Paul's claim that it stems from the Lord shows at least that he regarded it to be Christian tradition. Paul presents the expectation of the eschatological resurrection as belonging to the traditional beliefs and convictions of Christians. With his 'word of the Lord' Paul assures the Thessalonians that it was normal for Christians to expect a resurrection at the end of time.[3]

It is not unreasonable to assume that the Thessalonian community was not the first Christian community to be confronted with the problem of the deaths of Christians before the end of time. Other Christian communities may have had to cope with the same problem and solved it in the same way Paul did by pointing at the coming eschatological resurrection. If one accepts the usual dating of 1 Thessalonians as being around the year 50 C.E., it is hard to imagine that not one Christian had died until then.[4]

(2) It was concluded above that the expectation of the eschatological resurrection was already a traditional Christian belief before Paul wrote his letter to the Thessalonians. This thesis can be further substantiated by observing the various allusions to the eschatological resurrection in the gospel of Mark and the source Q. The expectation of the eschatological resurrection mirrored in these writings presupposes the familiarity of their readers with the expectation at issue. Mark 9:1

---

[1] There are basically two possibilities: either the 'word of the Lord' is recorded in verses 16-17 and verse 15 is Paul's own summary of this saying, or verse 15 contains the 'word of the Lord' and verses 16-17 are (Pauline) digressions made with the help of Jewish apocalyptic material; see G. Lüdemann, *Paulus*, pp. 242-254; T. Holtz, *Thessalonicher*, pp. 184-185.

[2] There are again two possibilities: the word stems either from the terrestrial Jesus, whose saying would have been transmitted to Paul through Christian tradition, or from a Christian prophecy, passed off as a revelation from the heavenly Jesus, and received by Paul himself or by some Christian prophet; see G. Lüdemann, *Paulus*, pp. 254-256; T. Holtz, *Thessalonicher*, pp. 183-185.

[3] Cf. P. Siber, *Mit Christus leben*, p. 21.

[4] For Lüdemann, the fact that there had been no deaths yet in Thessalonica is an indication that 1 Thessalonians must be dated much earlier; namely, around the year 40. However, his chronology of Paul's letters is highly debatable.

implies that in the Markan community Christians had died.[1] The confusion which arose as a result of these deaths was not caused by the deaths themselves, but by the fear that the kingdom of God would not come as soon as was expected. The expectation that the deceased Christians would be raised at the end of time was apparently an accepted idea for the readers, so much so that the author did not even feel the need to mention it. It was of greater importance to the author to take away the fear that these deaths would be taken as an indication that the kingdom was not coming soon or that it was not coming at all.

In the discussion on the resurrection between Jesus and the Sadducees (Mark 12:18-27) the belief in the eschatological resurrection is no less presupposed.[2] There is no reason to assume that what made the author include this discussion in his gospel was his fear that his readers rejected the idea of a coming resurrection like the Sadducees did. On the contrary, proof for the coming of the eschatological resurrection is not provided at all. This indicates that the author assumed his readers were already convinced that the resurrection would come about. Not the question of whether or not there would be a resurrection of the dead at all, but rather the brilliance of Jesus' reply seems to have been the point of interest for the author of Mark.[3] The scene is an anecdote with which the author wants to show that Jesus' knowledge and debating technique were superior to those of his enemies.[4] The topic of the discussion, the eschatological resurrection, is chosen, partly, because it enabled the Markan Jesus to demonstrate his skill in putting his adversaries to silence, and partly, because after the Sandhedrinists (12:12, cf. 11:27), the Pharisees and the Herodians (12:13) and before the Scribes (12:28), it was the turn of the Sadducees to be scored off by Jesus. The latter's victory could of course not be more spectacular than if he took the edge off the typically Sadducean rejection of the resurrection. The choice of the theme is no indication, therefore, that there were actual problems regarding the eschatological resurrection in Mark's community.

Thus, the two passages on the resurrection in Mark suggest that the expectation of the eschatological resurrection was something with which the readers of Mark were familiar. The fact that the author of

---

[1] See above, pp. 79-80.

[2] See above, pp. 80-81.

[3] The discussion on the resurrection does not serve, for instance, to announce in any way the resurrection of Jesus; see J. Gnilka, *Markus*, vol. II, pp. 160-161.

[4] D.E. Nineham, *The Gospel of St Mark* (PGC; Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1963), p. 318.

Mark places the sayings at issue in the mouth of Jesus does not in itself justify the conclusion that the expectation of the eschatological resurrection was already taught by Jesus himself. There is insufficient evidence to assume that these sayings stem from the historical Jesus. Mark 9:1 belongs to the category of sayings which tries to justify the delay of the kingdom of God. It is therefore unlikely that Jesus himself pronounced this saying.[1] It is also unlikely that Jesus' answer to the questions of the Sadducees stems from the historical Jesus. The answer looks too much like an attempt to highlight Jesus' brilliance as a debater with the Sadducees to be regarded as an authentic contribution of Jesus to an actual discussion.

(3) Likewise, in the source Q, the expectation of the eschatological resurrection is presented in such a way as to warrant the conclusion that the author assumes his readers' acquaintance with that expectation. Especially the connection which Q postulates between the resurrection and the final judgement reveals that the author assumes his readers were familiar with a scenario of the end of time including the resurrection. Although there are no indications that the author of Q, like Paul and Mark, knew of deaths within his community, one can safely assert that the eschatological resurrection must have been a well-known and accepted tenet to his readers. Not once does he feel the need to argue that there will be a resurrection, or to explain what the eschatological resurrection will be like.

In Q as well, the sayings about the eschatological resurrection are placed in the mouth of Jesus, but, again, there are not enough indications to assume that the historical Jesus pronounced these sayings. They appear in contexts in which the eschatological resurrection and the final judgement function as themes used in Christian missionary activity (Matt. 12:38-42/Luke 11:29-32 and Matt. 11:21-23/Luke 10:13-15). These sayings reflect a situation in which the mission to the gentiles is more successful than that to the Jews. Especially the statement that the repentant people of Nineveh will be better off than some of the Israelites seems to be a legitimation of the (successful) mission to the gentiles over against a less successful mission to the Jews.[2] This missionary temperament of the Christian church did not develop until

---

[1] E. Grässer, *Parusieverzögerung*, pp. 131-137; J. Gnilka, *Markus*, vol. II, p. 26.
[2] I.H. Marshall, *Luke*, p. 483, cf. p. 413.

some time after Jesus' death. It is unlikely, therefore, that these sayings stem from the historical Jesus.[1]

It is equally unlikely that the saying about the restoration of Israel (Matt 19:28/Luke 22:30) stems from the historical Jesus. In this passage the twelve disciples represent the twelve tribes of Israel. Such a view of the disciples can only have arisen in the time after Jesus' death.[2] The saying concerning the resurrection of the dead as an eschatological miracle demonstrating Jesus' divine mission (Matt. 11:4-5/Luke 7:22) must also be dated to the time after Jesus' death. The passage shows signs of theological redaction, for instance, the use of Old Testament quotations.[3] Furthermore, the passage reflects a historical context in which the Christian community tries to define its position vis-à-vis the community of John the Baptist.[4]

In summation, it can be concluded from Paul, Mark, and Q that Christians already expected the eschatological resurrection before Paul wrote his letter to the Thessalonians. Just like Paul, the author of the gospel according to Mark is aware of deaths of Christians. Unlike Paul, however, the author of Mark does not find it necessary to try to convince his readers that these deceased Christians will be raised. The expectation of the eschatological resurrection appears to be a tenet with which the readers of the gospel of Mark were familiar. Similarly, the author of the source Q supposes his readers to be acquainted with the eschatological resurrection. Although Mark and Q represent Jesus as speaking about the eschatological resurrection,[5] the sources do not pre-

---

[1] Cf. S. Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, pp. 362-367. The saying about the gathering of all the nations and their participation in the eternal glory (Matt. 8:11/Luke 13:28) presupposes nothing less than a situation in which gentiles took part in the Christian movement and Jews did not accept the gospel. Therefore, this saying cannot stem from the historical Jesus, either; S. Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, pp. 328-329.

[2] P. Vielhauer, 'Gottesreich und Menschensohn in der Verkündigung Jesu', in: P. Vielhauer, *Aufsätze zum Neuen Testament* (TB 31; München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1965), pp. 68-69; S. Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, p. 335. Yet, the idea that Jesus' disciples numbered twelve is quite old since it is already found in the pre-Pauline tradition cited in 1 Cor. 15:3-5.

[3] S. Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, p. 192. R. Pesch observes that the catalogue of wonders which appears in this passage reflects the Christian wonder-tradition with which the earliest Church tried to verify that Jesus was an eschatological prophet; R. Pesch, *Jesu ureigene Taten? Ein Beitrag zur Wunderfrage* (QD 52; Freiburg/Basel/Wien: Herder, 1970), pp. 35-48.

[4] S. Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, p. 193.

[5] If one considers the historical Jesus to be the earliest source of the 'word of the Lord' in 1 Thess. 4:15, which is less than certain, and assumes that the original saying contained a reference to the eschatological resurrection, which is likewise uncertain, then

sent sufficient evidence to conclude that the historical Jesus actually spoke about it.

(4) The examination of the passages on the eschatological resurrection which appear in the oldest Christian sources has led to the conclusion that the expectation of the eschatological resurrection was already part of the Christian belief as early as before 50 C.E. But one can go further back. It seems reasonable to assume that the expectation of the eschatological resurrection already belonged to the belief of Jesus' followers in the time of his terrestrial activity. Two arguments can be adduced in support of this assumption. (a) In Jewish literature earlier than the beginning of Christianity as well as in the earliest (Jewish-) Christian literature, this expectation is attested. (b) Jesus and all his immediate followers were Jews. One may assume, therefore, that Jesus and his followers, just as many of their Jewish contemporaries, expected a resurrection of the dead at the end of time.

The conclusion that the expectation of the eschatological resurrection was part of Christianity all along, is perfectly compatible with the picture of Jesus' movement as nowadays generally accepted. True, not much can be said with certainty about the movement aroused by Jesus during his ministry. It is generally agreed, however, that it was a movement focused on the end of time. Central to Jesus' message were his proclamation of the imminence of the kingdom of God and his exhortation to live already in accordance with the ethical demands of that kingdom.[1] The focus on the expectation of the kingdom of God is typical of the eschatological character of both Jesus' message and the movement around him. 'The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God has come near; repent, and believe in the good news.' This is Mark's summary of Jesus' message (Mark 1:15). This kingdom was not only expected to be realized in the near future, it was also believed to be already present in the person and actions of Jesus.[2] Jesus' followers saw him as the one who had announced and inaugurated the kingdom.

Paul, too, ascribed the expectation of the eschatological resurrection to the historical Jesus.

[1] See, for instance, N. Perrin, *Rediscovering the Teaching of Jesus* (NTLi; London: SCM Press, 1967), p. 54; M. de Jonge, *Jesus*, p. 62.

[2] See, for instance, Matt. 12:28/Luke 11:20; Matt. 11:4-5/Luke 7:22; Matt. 11:12-13/Luke 16:16; S. Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, p. 209; I.H. Marshall, *Luke*, p. 475. For the idea that God's kingdom was considered to be present in Jesus' preaching and actions, see, for instance, C.H. Dodd, *The Parables of the Kingdom* (London: Nisbet, ³1946); G.R. Beasley-Murray, *Kingdom*, pp. 71-146; M. de Jonge, *Jesus*, pp. 62-68.

In many of the writings of first century C.E. Judaism which deal with the events of the end of time, some concept or idea on life after death does indeed appear. Ideas on life after death, including the notion of the eschatological resurrection, were a set element in eschatological writings. Especially the combination of the idea of the resurrection and that of the final judgement, as attested in the source Q, occurs frequently.[1] Furthermore, from Josephus' description of first century C.E. Judaism, it appears that ideas about an after-life were current in broad circles of the Jewish people.[2] In a discussion of the three Jewish philosophical schools, Josephus points out that the Sadducees were the only school which did not believe in any form of life after death.[3] But elsewhere, too, Josephus makes mention of various Jewish ideas on life after death.[4]

(5) The Christian expectation that there will be a resurrection at the end of time is the natural continuation of the Jewish tradition concerning the eschatological resurrection. The language and ideas by which this expectation presents itself in Christian writings agree with those by which it expresses itself in contemporary Jewish writings. The oldest Christian sources—Paul, the gospel of Mark, and Q—demonstrate that the expectation of the eschatological resurrection already belonged to the Christian belief before the year 50. Although there is not enough evidence to argue that the sayings about the eschatological resurrection as transmitted in Mark and Q go back to the historical Jesus, there are nonetheless sound reasons to suppose that this expectation was one of

---

[1] See, for instance, Dan. 12:2; 4 Ezra 7:32-44; Bib. Ant. 3:10; 1 Enoch 51:1-5; Sib. Or. 4:181-183.

[2] Josephus, *Cont. Ap.* II, 218.

[3] Josephus, *Bell. Jud.* II, 119, 154-158, 162-166. Josephus' view that almost all Jews expected a resurrection of some kind has been questioned by G. Barth, 'Umstrittener Auferstehungsglaube', in: L. Bormann, K. del Tredici, A Standhartinger (eds.), *Religious Propaganda and Missionary Competition in the New Testament World. Essays Honoring Dieter Georgi* (NovT.S 74; Leiden/New York/Köln: E.J. Brill, 1994), pp. 117-132. Barth argues that up to the end of the first century C.E. the belief in a resurrection was disputed. He adduces his arguments from the denial of life after death found in Eccl. 3:19-21; Sir. 17:27; 41:1-12, and from the scepsis concerning life after death as expressed in Wis. 2-5; 1 Enoch 102:6-8; 2 Macc. 12:43-45; T. Job 39:12-13; and several rabbinical writings. However, the scepsis attested in these passages does not at all need to reflect real scepsis. In most cases, it is part of the author's literary technique. Although in Ecclesiastes and Wisdom of Jesus Sirach the belief in life after death is abnegated, most eschatological writings of first century C.E. Judaism accept some form of belief in life after death.

[4] See, for instance, Josephus, *Bell. Jud.* I, 650; III, 372-375; VI, 46-48; VII, 341-357; cf. *Ant. Jud.* XVII, 349-354; *Cont. Ap.* II, 217-218.

the convictions of the Jesus movement from the outset. Jesus and his followers probably expected a resurrection at the end of time, just like many of their contemporaries.

VI. THE EXPECTATION OF JESUS' PAROUSIA

Similar to the expectation of the eschatological resurrection, the expectation of Jesus' coming in glory has its origin in Jewish eschatology. Tracing the origins of the latter, however, is more difficult than an examination of the former. The main difficulty is that in the Jewish literature prior to Christianity the Jewish tradition underlying the concept of Jesus' second coming is not well attested. As in the previous section, the initial stage of the research will retrieve the earliest traceable form of the Christian expectation of Jesus' coming at the end of time (section a). Then, the Jewish tradition underlying that form of the hope of Jesus' parousia will be identified (section b). Finally, an attempt will be made to answer the question why the expectation of Jesus' parousia arose (section c).

a. *The earliest traceable form of the expectation of Jesus' parousia*

(1) In his letters Paul refers to the future coming of Jesus in about 21 passages. These passages can be categorized in three groups: (a) those in which Paul states in some fashion that Jesus will come at the end of time: 1 Thess. 1:10; 2:19; 3:13; 4:16-17; 5:1-4, 23; 1 Cor. 1:7; 4:5; 11:26; 15:23; 16:22; Phil. 3:20; (b) those in which Paul uses the phrase 'day of our Lord Jesus Christ' (or a synonymous expression):[1] 1 Cor. 3:12-15; 5:5; 2 Cor. 1:14; Phil. 1:6, 10; 2:16; and (c) those in which Paul mentions Jesus' activity on the last day so that his coming is implied: 1 Thess. 1:3; 2 Cor. 5:10; Rom. 5:9. Two passages are inconclusive: Phil. 4:1, 5.[2] Only in three passages—1 Cor. 15:23-28, 1 Thess.

---

[1] The phrase 'day of our Lord Jesus Christ' and its variations refer indirectly to Jesus' coming at the end of time. The phrase 'day of our Lord Jesus Christ' is the Christian adaptation of the Old Testament notion of 'the day of the Lord', which is the day on which God will intervene once and for all; G. von Rad, G. Delling, 'ἡμέρα', *ThWNT*, vol. II (1935), pp. 945-956.

[2] In Phil. 4:1 Paul calls the Philippians his 'crown' (στέφανος) which is most likely a metaphor for the favourable judgement Paul hopes to receive on the last day; see Phil. 2:16 (cf. 1 Thess. 2:19; 2 Cor. 1:14) and, in the immediate context, the mention of Jesus' parousia in 3:20-21. In Phil. 4:5 Paul states that 'the Lord is near' which can either refer to the imminence of his coming (cf. 1 Cor. 16:22; Rom. 13:12; J. Gnilka, *Philipperbrief*, p. 169) or to his spiritual proximity in the congregation of believers (cf. Ps. 144:18[LXX]; E. Lohmeyer, *Philipper*, p. 169).

4:16-17, and Phil. 3:20-21—does Paul speak about Jesus' second coming somewhat more extensively. These passages reflect the following concept of that coming.[1]

Jesus' coming itself is described as a descent from 'heaven' (1 Thess. 1:10; Phil 3:20) with a 'cry of command', an 'archangel's call', and a 'sound of God's trumpet' (1 Thess. 4:16). At his coming Jesus will be accompanied by angels (1 Thess. 4:16) and by 'all the saints' (1 Thess. 3:13). These saints are not angels, but most likely those righteous ones who, as a special reward, were taken up into God's presence either just before or directly after their death.[2] Paul does not mention any further characteristics of Jesus' coming in the future.

Paul does, however, elaborate on the actions which Jesus will perform at his coming. In 1 Thess. 1:10 Paul writes that Jesus will rescue his followers from the 'wrath that is coming.' The coming wrath (ὀργὴ ἐρχόμενη) is part of God's final judgement.[3] Christians will be saved from this wrath by Jesus, he is their saviour. The verb ῥύεσθαι, 'to save', is a synonym of σῴζειν which is found, for instance, in Rom. 5:9. There, too, it is said that on the last day Jesus will save (σῴζειν) the believers from the wrath (ὀργή) of God. In Phil. 3:20-21 Paul calls Jesus the Christians' saviour (σωτήρ) who will come from heaven and 'transform the body of our humiliation that it may be conformed to the body of his glory, by the power that also enables him to make all things subject to himself.' The mention of Jesus as the one who will ef-

---

[1] The most important Pauline passages on Jesus' parousia (1 Cor. 15:23-28; 1 Thess. 4:13-18; Phil. 3:20-21) have already been examined in previous chapters.

[2] Whether these 'saints' (ἅγιοι) are angels or human righteous ones is a debated issue (T. Holtz, *Thessalonicher*, pp. 146-147). There are sufficient grounds, however, to argue that human righteous ones are meant; namely, those special righteous ones who have been taken up to heaven in previous times as a special reward (martyrs, Elijah, Enoch, e.a.). Firstly, in Paul (οἱ) ἅγιοι almost always refers to humans, i.e., Christians (B. Rigaux, *Thessaloniciens*, pp. 491-492). Secondly, a useful parallel occurs in 4 Ezra where it is said that God's eschatological agent will come with 'those who are with him' (7:28; 13:52). These include those 'who have not tasted death' (6:26) as well as those special righteous ones who were 'taken up' after their death to live with God's eschatological agent, as, for instance, it is promised to Ezra himself (14:9; cf. 8:51, 62); M.E. Stone, *Fourth Ezra. A Commentary of the Book of Fourth Ezra* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990), p. 215, cf. p. 172. Just like the author of 4 Ezra, Paul proves to be familiar with the tradition according to which special righteous ones are taken up to heaven soon after their deaths. This is clear from Paul's view on his own death and resurrection in Phil. 1:23; 3:9-10, as well as from his view on Jesus' heavenly resurrection. For further discussion of this tradition, see chapter IX, pp. 139-157.

[3] The idea, of course, is adopted from Jewish eschatology; see L. Mattern, *Das Verständnis des Gerichtes bei Paulus* (AThANT 47; Zürich/Stuttgart: Zwingli, 1966), p. 59; B. Rigaux, *Thessaloniciens*, pp. 196-197.

fectuate the transformation is remarkable since in other passages Paul says that it is God who will transform those alive at the time of Jesus' coming. The perception that God is the one who will transform people on the last day is in conformity with the view of God as the one who will re-create the dead (1 Cor. 15:51-52).[1] The actions of God and those of God's eschatological agent overlap; this same phenomenon can also be observed in (non-Christian) Jewish literature of the time.[2] In Phil. 3:20-21 Jesus' act of transforming people is a sign of his power as well as an integral element of his rule over everything and everyone.[3] In Phil. 3:21, just as in 1 Cor. 15:27, Paul describes the power with which Jesus will rule on the last day by using the words of Ps. 8:7.[4] In sum, Jesus will come as a ruler appointed by God who will subject everything to his power and save those who believe in him.

Besides being a ruler on behalf of God, Jesus will assist God in the final judgement. The role Jesus plays in the last judgement coincides with the role of God. On the one hand Paul speaks about the judgement of God and about God as the one who will judge everyone.[5] On the other hand he writes in 2 Cor. 5:10 that all 'must appear before the judgement seat of Christ, so that each may receive recompense for what he or she has done in the body, whether good or evil.' Similarly, in 1 Cor. 4:1-5 Paul reacts to the Corinthian accusations by saying that Jesus will be his judge, who, at his coming, 'will bring to light the things now hidden in darkness and will disclose the purposes of the heart' (v. 5).[6] A certain overlap of the actions of God and those of his final agent, especially at the last judgement, is traditional in Jewish eschatological literature.[7] In sum, Jesus will come at the end of time as a ruler and as a (deputy) judge.

---

[1] Compare also Rom. 8:17 and 2 Cor. 3:18.

[2] See L.J. Kreitzer, *Eschatology, passim.*

[3] J. Gnilka, *Philipperbrief*, pp. 207-208.

[4] For Paul's use of this psalm, see chapter III, pp. 63-64.

[5] See, for instance, Rom. 2:5-6, 16; 3:6; 14:10; 1 Cor. 5:13.

[6] Especially the act of examining man's heart is an act traditionally ascribed to God; see, for instance, 1 Sam. 16:7; Jer. 17:10; 2 Apoc. Bar. 83:3; G.D. Fee, *Corinthians*, p. 163.

[7] H. Windisch, *Der zweite Korintherbrief* (KEK; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1924), pp. 170-171; H. Lietzmann, *Korinther*, p. 123; C. Wolff, *Der zweite Brief des Paulus an die Korinther* (ThHK; Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1989), p. 144. Compare, for instance, 4 Ezra 7:33-44 (God's judgement) with 4 Ezra 12:31-33 and 13:37-38 (the messiah's judgement); M.E. Stone, *Fourth Ezra*, p. 150. Compare also the close relationship between the eschatological agent and God with regard to the final judgement in 1 Enoch. God puts his Chosen One on his throne and the latter will judge according to the judgement of the former (1 Enoch 61:8-9). See also below, pp. 105-106.

In the majority of the Pauline passages on Jesus' coming at the end of time, only the event itself is referred to; none of Jesus' actions are mentioned. These allusions function as quick references to the end of time in general or to the last day as the day on which reward and punishment will be assigned. In the openings of Paul's letters and in the paraenetic sections, Jesus' coming (or day) is frequently mentioned as a reminder of the judicial activity he will develop when he comes on that day (1 Cor. 3:12-15; 5:5). It is the day on which Christians will be found blameless (1 Thess. 3:13; 5:23; Phil. 1:10), the day on which all Christians, Paul included, may boast about the good works they have done (1 Thess. 2:19; 2 Cor. 1:14; Phil. 2:16). In other passages the day or coming of the Lord is simply the end of time; that is, the last day of the old and the first of the new aeon. The Lord's supper is to be celebrated until Jesus comes (1 Cor. 11:26), an arrival which is eagerly awaited (μαράνα θά, 'Lord, come!', 1 Cor. 16:22). Until that last day, Christians will receive strength (1 Cor. 1:8) to bring the good work to completion (Phil. 1:6). These quick references to Jesus' parousia show how fixed the expectation of Jesus' coming at the end of time was already established in Paul's time. It was a standard Christian concept which did not need any further explanation.

Paul designates Jesus' coming at the end of time five times as his παρουσία.[1] This term appears to be a fixed term for Jesus' coming at the end of time. It probably functioned already as such in pre-Pauline tradition. In his first letter to the Thessalonians Paul uses it four times without any clarification. In other first century C.E. Christian literature the term is found as well, also in writings which are literarily independent of Paul's letters.[2] However, the term παρουσία was not *the* technical term for Jesus' coming at the end of time, neither for Paul nor for Christians in the time before or after him.[3] Paul also uses the term παρουσία for arrivals of other persons[4] and, just like other Christian authors of the first century C.E., he can speak about Jesus' coming at the end of time without using the term παρουσία.

As A. Deissmann has shown the term παρουσία is of pagan Hellenistic origin. It means 'presence', of persons as well as of gods, or 'coming', in particular the visit a ruler paid to any of his cities or

---

[1] 1 Thess. 2:19; 3:13; 4:15; 5:23; 1 Cor. 15:23.

[2] See, for instance, Matt. 24:3, 27, 37, 39; cf. 2 Thess. 2:1, 8; Jas. 5:7, 8; 2 Pet. 1:16; 3:4; 1 John 2:28.

[3] Only for scholars has the term become the technical expression for Jesus' coming at the end of time.

[4] 1 Cor. 16:17; 2 Cor. 7:6, 7; 10:10; Phil. 1:26; 2:12.

territories.[1] Such a visit did not pass unnoticed in Hellenistic times, according to Deissmann, for it was accompanied by taxes to finance the visit, coinage as a remembrance, and offerings. Sometimes the visit of the ruler was taken as the occasion for starting a new reckoning of the years. This indicated that the visit was felt to mark the beginning of a new era. Consequently, Deissmann was possibly correct in assuming that, when Christians began using the word παρουσία to refer to the glorious coming of Jesus at the end of time, they did so because the word had the connotation of 'magnificent visit of a ruler to his district.' On the other hand it should be remembered that the term παρουσία is also a very common term for any arrival or appearance. The possibility cannot be ruled out, therefore, that the early Christian use of the term is simply the continuation of the use of the word in its common, general meaning.

The Pauline view of Jesus' coming at the end of time can be summarized as follows: it is the coming of God's eschatological agent, a ruler and judge who will act on behalf of God on the last day. Jesus will come down from heaven to save the believers from God's wrath and, in association with God, to judge the world.

(2) The author of the gospel of Mark does not speak about Jesus' coming at the end of time as often as Paul, but he does mention it in three instances: 8:38, 13:26-27, and 14:62. His concept of Jesus' parousia, however, corresponds exactly to that found in Paul. He, too, speaks about Jesus as the ruler and judge who descends from heaven on the last day.

Mark's description of Jesus' coming resembles that of Paul: Jesus will come on the clouds from heaven with power and glory (13:26; 14:62), accompanied by the angels (8:38). These angels will then be sent to the corners of the earth to collect the believers (13:26), a traditional Jewish idea concerning the fate of the righteous ones.[2]

Mark 8:38 emphasizes Jesus' role as 'advocate': 'Those who are ashamed of me and of my words in this adulterous and sinful generation, of them the Son of Man will also be ashamed when he comes in the glory of his Father with the holy angels.' The Son of Man's shame of the unbelievers will prevent him from interceding for them in the

---

[1] A. Deissmann, *Licht*, pp. 314-320; cf. A. Oepke, 'παρουσία', *ThWNT*, vol. V (1954), pp. 856-869; W. Radl, *Ankunft*, pp. 177-181.

[2] See, for instance, Isa. 11:11; 43:6.

last judgement.[1] The Son of Man will not speak up for them at the moment of judging. Similarly, the idea that the Son of Man will sit 'at the right hand of the Power' as described in 14:62 is connected to the view of Jesus as involved in the last judgement. Jesus' enemies, who are directly addressed in this passage, as well as Jesus' followers will be forced to acknowledge his power and accept his final verdict over them at his coming.[2]

This last passage also shows that when Jesus will come at the end of time he will have the authority to rule. He will come with 'power and glory' (8:38; 13:26-27) which demonstrate his authority as ruler; more precisely, as ruler appointed by God. Clothed with the power of his Father, Jesus will order the angels to collect the chosen ones (13:27). All people, good and evil, will have to acknowledge his power (14:62).

In Mark's presentation of Jesus' coming in the future, Jesus is regularly designated the Son of Man, a title missing in Paul. Furthermore, all passages on the coming Son of Man are sayings put in the mouth of Jesus and phrased in the third person singular. Nevertheless, it is absolutely clear that Mark and his readers took the title 'Son of Man' as a designation of Jesus. The title Son of Man is frequently used in Mark. It is used not only in connection with Jesus' parousia but also with his death and resurrection and with his earthly activity.[3] Apparently, the identification of Jesus with the Son of Man did not need any explication. For that reason the author of Mark can even quote directly from Dan. 7:13 when speaking about Jesus as the coming Son of Man in 13:26 and 14:62.

In sum: for the author of Mark, Jesus' coming was the appearance of the Son of Man as predicted in Daniel 7. He would come with the clouds of heaven, with power and glory, as a ruler and advocate.

(3) In the source Q the expectation of Jesus' coming is found in five passages: Matt. 10:32/Luke 12:8; Matt. 24:44/Luke 12:40; Matt. 23:39/Luke 13:35; Matt. 24:27, 37, 39/Luke 17:24, 26, 30; Matt. 19:28/Luke 22:29-30.

---

[1] M.D. Hooker, *The Gospel according to Mark* (BNTC; London: A. & C. Black, 1991), p. 210; J. Gnilka, *Markus*, vol. II, p. 62.

[2] M.D. Hooker, *Mark*, p. 362; J. Gnilka, *Markus*, vol. II, p. 282.

[3] Bultmann divided the Son of Man sayings into three categories: (a) those about his eschatological coming and activity; (b) those about his death and resurrection; (c) those about his terrestrial activity; R. Bultmann, *Theologie des Neuen Testaments* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 9th edition by O. Merk, 1984), pp. 31-32. H.E. Tödt worked Bultmann's scheme out more precisely; H.E. Tödt, *Der Menschensohn in der synoptischen Überlieferung* (Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1959). See also below, p. 118.

Jesus' appearance is compared with lightning flashing through the sky (Matt. 24:27/Luke 17:24). With this comparison the author makes it clear that everyone will see Jesus' coming; it will be a cosmic event which no one will be able to escape.[1] The author continues by comparing Jesus' appearance with the coming of the flood in the time of Noah (Matt. 24:37/Luke 17:26). Each person who can read the signs of the time knows that Jesus is coming, but to those who do not listen, his arrival will be a surprise. However, just as with the coming of the flood, no one will be able to escape the coming of the Son of Man.

The comparison of the day of the Son of Man with the day when the flood covered the earth in the time of Noah also alludes to the fact that the coming of the Son of Man will usher in the last judgement.[2] His coming will bring retribution: punishment for the wicked and reward for the righteous. One must be ready for that day just like the people of Noah ought to have prepared themselves for the coming flood. Not only this saying but all other sayings about the future coming and activity of Jesus in the source Q refer, one way or another, to the final judgement. Matt. 10:32-33/Luke 12:8-9 makes Jesus say: 'Everyone who acknowledges me before others, the Son of Man also will acknowledge before the angels of God; but whoever denies me before others will be denied before the angels of God.' The Son of Man's acknowledgement and denial of certain people in front of the angels evokes the traditional idea of the court of justice at the final judgement.[3] In his judging the Son of Man will be assisted by his disciples. In Matt. 19:28/Luke 22:30 Jesus promises the disciples that they 'will sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel.' Thus, Jesus' coming will be the coming of a judge.

In Matt. 24:44/Luke 12:40 the author states again that one has to be prepared for Jesus' coming 'for the Son of Man is coming at an unexpected hour.' The emphasis on the unexpectedness of the coming of Jesus, as well as the image of the thief in the night (Matt. 24:43/Luke 12:39), is also found in 1 Thess. 5:1-4. However, in Q this idea is placed explicitly in the context of the final judgement. One must be

---

[1] E. Klostermann, *Matthäusevangelium*, p. 195.

[2] The comparision of the last judgement with the coming of the flood in the days of Noah and the history of Lot is derived from Jewish tradition; D. Lührmann, *Die Redaktion der Logienquelle* (WMANT 33; Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1969), pp. 75-83; I.H. Marshall, *Luke*, p. 662.

[3] See 11QMelch. 10, 14; 1 Enoch 99:3. For the function of the angels in the final judgement, see D.C. Carlson, 'Vengeance and Angelic Mediation in *Testament of Moses* 9 and 10', *JBL* 101 (1982), pp. 85-95; G.W.E. Nickelsburg, *Resurrection*, pp. 11-42.

ready for the coming day of the Son of Man because one will be judged on that day.[1] The people in the time of Noah serve as an example of what will happen if one is not ready, that is, if one does not believe that the Son of Man is coming soon.

Just like the author of Mark, the author of Q speaks about Jesus' return as the coming of the Son of Man. Again, the term Son of Man is used only in the words of Jesus and in such a way as to suggest that the Son of Man is someone else. Yet, in Q, too, it is absolutely clear that the coming Son of Man will be Jesus. There is one passage (Matt. 23:39/Luke 13:35) in which the author speaks about Jesus' coming without using this title. There Jesus bids Jerusalem farewell, saying that it will not see him until the time that they will say: 'Blessed is the one who comes in the name of the Lord.' This passage does not refer to Jesus' triumphal entry into Jerusalem but to his coming at the end of time.[2] Here Q does not use the title Son of Man but a quotation from Ps. 117:26(LXX).[3] Nevertheless, when the author of Q speaks about Jesus' coming, he normally calls him the Son of Man. He also uses the title Son of Man to designate Jesus in his earthly ministry. In Q there are no sayings about the death and resurrection of the Son of Man, since Q does not mention Jesus' death and resurrection at all.

In short, the concept of Jesus' future coming in Q concurs with that found in Mark and differs from that found in Paul only in that Paul does not use the title Son of Man. The author of Q expected Jesus' coming at the end of time as the intervention of God's eschatological agent who would judge everyone. The author of Q does not say very much about the way Jesus will act as a ruler at his coming. Nevertheless, the comparison of his coming with lightning flashing through the sky is an indication, not only of the unexpectedness and cosmic dimensions of the event, but also of Jesus' power.

(4) The earliest traceable view of Jesus' coming—that is, the view as transmitted in the epistles of Paul, the gospel of Mark, and the source Q—can be summarized as follows. At the end of time Jesus will come

---

[1] Paul speaks about the unexpectedness of the coming of the day in order to warn the Thessalonians that the death of some of them does not mean that the end of time has been delayed.

[2] In Matthew this saying appears only after the narrative of Jesus' triumphal entry. In Luke there might be some connection between Jesus' farewell words to Jerusalem and his triumphal entry, but the language used for the entry in Jerusalem is different; I.H. Marshall, *Luke*, p. 527.

[3] The fact that Q quotes here from Ps. 117:26(LXX) does not imply a hidden claim of the title 'messiah' for Jesus. This title is completely absent in Q.

down from heaven as God's eschatological agent. He will act as a judge and a ruler. His actions will result in the salvation of the believers. Altogether there are two differences between the way Paul, on the one hand, and Q and Mark, on the other, present Jesus' second coming. Unlike Q and Mark, Paul speaks about Jesus' coming with the term παρουσία. Unlike Paul, the authors of Q and Mark speak about the coming Jesus as the coming Son of Man.

b. *The Jewish tradition of the expectation of the coming of God's heavenly eschatological agent*

(1) The Jewish tradition from which the expectation of Jesus' coming at the end of time derives, is not easy to identify. Jesus' followers expected that Jesus would come as God's eschatological intermediary. From Jewish literature of the first centuries B.C.E. and C.E. it is clear that there were several kinds of eschatological intermediaries expected in the future. There is a large category of humans or angels which were expected to assist God in carrying out his plan for the final stage of history.[1] The best known example of an expected eschatological intermediary is the Davidic messiah such as is presented, for instance, in Ps. Sol. 17:21. Another, quite different eschatological intermediary is the angel Michael as figuring, for instance, in the War Scroll (1QM). Not all these expectations can be considered to represent the tradition from which the expectation of Jesus' parousia stems. This expectation goes back to one particular tradition; namely, that of the coming of the heavenly eschatological agent.

This tradition can be identified in Jewish literature from the centuries around the beginning of the era. The criteria one should use to retrieve this tradition are the ideas and language which Christians utilized to shape their hope of Jesus' coming at the end of time. One should look for passages that speak about the coming of God's eschato-

[1] The literature on these expected eschatological intermediaries includes: P. Volz, *Eschatologie*, pp. 173-229; S. Mowinckel, *He that Cometh* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1956); D.S. Russell, *Method*, pp. 304-352; E. Schürer, *History*, vol. II, pp. 488-554; J. Neusner, W.S. Green, E.S. Frerichs (eds.), *Judaisms and Their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era* (Cambridge: University Press, 1987); A. Chester, 'Jewish Messianic Expectations and Mediatorial Figures and Pauline Christology', in: M. Hengel, U. Keckel (eds.), *Paulus und das antike Judentum* (WUNT 58; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1991), pp. 17-89; J.H. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Messiah, passim*; K. Koch, 'Messias und Menschensohn. Die zweistufige Messianologie der jüngeren Apokalyptik', *JBTh* 8 (1993), pp. 73-102; F. García Martínez, 'Messianische Erwartungen in den Qumranschriften', *JBTh* 8 (1993), pp. 171-208.

logical agent, who will rule, pass judgement on everybody, and save the righteous ones. Such an eschatological intermediary, henceforth designated as the coming heavenly eschatological agent, occurs in the following passages: Sib. Or. 5:108-110, 158-161, 414-427 (428-433); 4 Ezra 13:1-13, 25-26, 33-38, 51-52 (7:28-29; 11:37-12:3; 12:31-34); 1 Enoch 37-71, *passim*; 2 Apoc. Bar. 39:7-40:4 (29:3-30:1; 72:2-73:1).

(2) In four passages of the fifth book of the Sibylline Oracles[1] the author speaks about a heavenly figure who will come at the end of time as ruler and judge.[2] Each of these passages which deal with the eschatological events starts with several oracles against various nations. Then, the return of Nero as eschatological adversary is described.[3] Nero's return is followed by the coming of the heavenly eschatological agent who will defeat Nero and all other enemies, thereby establishing eternal salvation for God's people. The eschatological intermediary, who is named king (βασιλεύς, 108), star (ἀστήρ, 158), and man (ἀνήρ, 414), is of heavenly origin, for he comes from God (or the gods) (θεόθεν, 108), that is, from heaven (οὐρανόθεν, 158; νῶτα οὐρανίων, 414). On his arrival he will act as a warrior. He will destroy God's enemies (109, 159-161, 415-419), yet his victories will be part of God's judgement (110). The heavenly agent is sent by God and acts in his name since it is God who gives him the sceptre with which he will rule over the whole world (415).[4] His actions will result in the eternal salvation of the people of God (420-433).

In the sixth vision of Ezra which is recorded in the fourth book of Ezra,[5] a man (*homo*)[6] is envisioned who comes from the sea and who

---

[1] The fifth book of the Sibylline Oracles is usually dated around the end of the first century C.E.; see J.J. Collins, *The Sibylline Oracles of Egyptian Judaism* (SBL.DS 13; Missoula: SBL/Scholars Press, 1974), pp. 94-95.

[2] J.J. Collins, *Sibylline Oracles*, p. 74. One of the four passages on the heavenly figure (256-259) contains a Christian interpolation (257), the only one in book 5. Because of this interpolation, the passage is of no avail for the present examination of the heavenly agent.

[3] See L.J. Lietaert Peerbolte, *The Antecedents of Antichrist. A Traditio-Historical Study of the Earliest Christian Views on Eschatological Opponents* (Diss. Leiden, 1995), pp. 327-330.

[4] The aorists in this passage have a future meaning; see J.J. Collins, in: *OTP*, vol. I, p. 403; cf. R. Kühner, B. Gerth, *Ausführliche Grammatik der Griechischen Sprache* (Hannover/Leipzig: Hahnsche Buchhandlung, ³1898), vol. II, ii, p. 166.

[5] 4 Ezra is to be dated at the end of the first century C.E.; see M.E. Stone, *Fourth Ezra*, pp. 9-10.

[6] Due to homoeoarkton, part of 13:3 ('and I looked and behold this wind made something like the figure of a man come up out of the heart of the sea') is missing in the Latin version; see M.E. Stone, *Fourth Ezra*, p. 381.

flies with the clouds of heaven. This being destroys all enemies of God's people with the breath of his mouth whereby he delivers the righteous ones (13:1-13). When the visionary asks for an explanation of the vision he is told that the 'man' is to be identified with the saviour figure seen in previous visions and mentioned in previous dialogues.[1] The 'man' is God's son, who appeared in an earlier vision as a lion (11:37; 12:31-32). He is also named God's messiah whom God has kept until the end of days (12:32). The fact that he bears the title 'messiah', traditionally a title for an earthly, human being,[2] does not detract from the heavenly character and origin of this eschatological agent.[3] As messiah he will be revealed (*revelabitur*, 7:28; 13:32). He will be accompanied by beings who are 'with him' (13:52). He will proceed as a judge (12:31-34; 13:37-38) but even more as a warrior (13:5, 8-11). The result of his actions will be the salvation of the righteous ones (12:34; 13:26, 49-50).[4] In short, the heavenly eschatological agent will come to deliver the righteous ones on God's behalf.[5]

In the Similitudes of Enoch (1 Enoch 37-71)[6] the expectation of a coming heavenly eschatological agent at the end of time is found throughout the book. In this writing the heavenly eschatological agent

---

[1] Cf. M.E. Stone, *Fourth Ezra*, pp. 207-213.

[2] The word messiah (anointed) is used for kings, (high)priests, and prophets; see M. de Jonge, 'The Earliest Christian Use of *Christos*: Some Suggestions', *NTS* 32 (1986), pp. 321-343, esp. 329-333. In eschatological contexts the term is sometimes used to denote the final royal descendant from the line of David; see, for instance, Ps. Sol. 17:21.

[3] Thus, contrary to the traditional usage of the word messiah, the word is used in 4 Ezra for a heavenly person.

[4] Due to the author's aim to collect several traditions concerning the eschatological events and combine them into one scenario, he speaks of two judgements. The first is a preliminary one, executed by the heavenly agent as the prelude to his own kingdom (12:31-33; 13:37-38). The second judgement is the final judgement, executed by God after the messianic kingdom has run its course and after the resurrection (7:28-44); M.E. Stone, *Fourth Ezra*, p. 150.

[5] The idea that the heavenly eschatological agent will act on behalf of God is reflected in several passages. He will save *God's* people (12:34) and he is named *God's* messiah (7:29) and *God's* son (13:32, 37, 52). It is *God's* plan of salvation which he will carry out (13:29).

[6] The date of origin of the Similitudes of Enoch is much disputed. If one takes the reference to an attack of the Parthians (66:5), which is the only reference to a historical event in all 25 chapters, as a clue, the book may have been composed in the period from the first century B.C.E. to the third century C.E., since in that period of time the Parthians were a threat to the Jews in Palestine; cf. E. Schürer, *History*, vol. III, pp. 256-259. The book is usually dated to the first century C.E.; M.A. Knibb, 'The Date of the Parables of Enoch: A Critical Review', *NTS* 25 (1978-79), pp. 345-359; see also the review of options given by J. Uhlig, *Das äthiopische Henochbuch* (JSHRZ V,6; Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1987), pp. 574-575.

is given more than one title, too.[1] Nevertheless, whatever title he receives, the concept of the eschatological agent is the same throughout the book.[2] More strongly than in 4 Ezra and Sib. Or. 5, the eschatological agent is presented as a heavenly figure: he is perceived by the visionary as being with God in heaven (46:1-2) and as seated on God's throne of glory (55:4).[3] At the end of time the heavenly agent will appear to the world (69:29) to pass judgement on all, the righteous as well as the unrighteous ones (49:4; 51:3; 61:8; 69:27). The descent of the eschatological agent is not explicitly described. All that is said is that at the appropriate time he will 'appear'[4] before the righteous ones (38:2; 69:29), or 'rise' (i.e., appear; 51:5),[5] pronounce the judgement, and dwell among the righteous ones (55:4).[6] It is the eschatological agent who judges, but it is God's judgement which he passes. He is appointed by God (61:8) and he will judge according to the word and judgement of God (61:9). The execution of the verdict, the destruction of the enemies, is also carried out by the heavenly agent (46:4-6; 62:2-3). The righteous ones, however, will dwell with the eschatological agent forever (62:14).

A fourth writing in which the expectation of the coming of a heavenly eschatological agent is attested is the second Apocalypse of Baruch.[7] As in 4 Ezra and 1 Enoch 37-71, the eschatological agent in 2 Apoc. Bar. is given the title messiah, although he is not presented as an

---

[1] The main titles used are three: Chosen One (15 times), Son of Man (14 times), Messiah (twice); J. Theisohn, *Der auserwählte Richter. Untersuchungen zum traditionsgeschichtlichen Ort der Menschensohngestalt der Bilderreden des Äthiopischen Henoch* (StUNT 12; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1975), pp. 31-35; cf. J.C. VanderKam, 'Righteous One, Messiah, Chosen One, and Son of Man in 1 Enoch 37-71', in: J.H. Charlesworth (ed.), *Messiah*, pp. 169-191.

[2] J. Theisohn, *Richter*, p. 49.

[3] The throne upon which the heavenly agent sits is God's throne. He is placed on it by God; J. Theisohn, *Richter*, p. 81.

[4] This and all subsequent quotations of 1 Enoch are taken from M.A. Knibb's translation in *AOT*, pp. 169-319.

[5] Cf. J. Theisohn, *Richter*, p. 43.

[6] The fact that the eschatological agent is depicted as sitting on a throne when he comes to judge (69:29) does not mean that the judgement will take place in heaven where the visionary saw him sitting on a throne at an earlier moment. His sitting on a throne during judgement is rather mentioned because tradition often represented judges as exercising their office while sitting on a throne; see J. Theisohn, *Richter*, pp. 81-91. Furthermore, it is mentioned no-where that the people will go up to the heavenly throne of the eschatological agent in order to be judged. The judge's movement is from heaven to earth, but it is not depicted in detail.

[7] The second Apocalypse of Baruch is generally dated to the end of the first century C.E.; P. Bogaert, *L'Apocalypse syriaque de Baruch* (SC 144-145; Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1969), vol. I, pp. 294-295.

earthly, human being. The eschatological agent (messiah) is a heavenly person; he will be 'revealed' (29:3)[1] and after his stay on earth he will return; specifically he will return to the celestial realm from which he came (30:1). The main task of the eschatological agent in 2 Apoc. Bar. is to establish a kingdom.[2] He will do so by destroying the leader of the unrighteous ones (40:1) as well as all the nations (39:7; 72:2), and by saving the remnant of God's people (40:2). His destruction of the enemies is at the same time a judgement, for they will be 'charged' with all their iniquities (40:1). The possessive pronoun in 'my messiah' (40:1; 72:2) exhibits the close relationship between God and the heavenly agent. He will act in God's name.

(3) The expectation of the coming of a heavenly eschatological agent which is attested in the four writings discussed above and the idea of Jesus' coming at the end of time can be considered as belonging to one and the same tradition: the tradition of the coming heavenly eschatological agent.[3] However, the passages on the coming heavenly eschatological agent which are found in Sib. Or. 5, 4 Ezra, 1 Enoch 37-71, and 2 Apoc. Bar. are of more recent date than the rise of the expectation of Jesus' coming at the end of time. It is therefore impossible to explain the concept of Jesus' parousia as the Christian adaptation of the Jewish concept of the coming heavenly eschatological agent as attested

---

[1] This and all subsequent quotations of 2 Apocalypse Baruch are taken from A.F.J. Klijn's translation in *OTP*, vol. II, pp. 615-652.

[2] In chapters 29-30 and 39-40 the kingdom which the messiah will establish is presented as a temporary kingdom after which the messiah will return to God. Then the resurrection will take place (30:2-5) and the world of corruption will be ended (40:3). In chapters 72-74, however, the messianic kingdom does not seem to be temporary.

[3] So far, the writings found in the caves at Qumran have not yet yielded any real parallel to the notion of coming heavenly eschatological agents. For a review of the material available from Qumran, see A.S. van der Woude, *Die messianischen Vorstellungen der Gemeinde von Qumran* (SSN 3; Assen: Van Gorcum, 1957); F. García Martínez, 'Erwartungen', *passim*. The closest parallel is found in the description of Melchizedek as a heavenly mediator, judge, and warrior in 11QMelchizedek. Although some of his functions resemble the functions of the heavenly eschatological agents in Sib. Or. 5, 4 Ezra, 1 Enoch 37-71, and 2 Apoc. Bar., Melchizedek is not pictured as descending from heaven. On the contrary, his place of action is in heaven. Melchizedek should rather be seen, therefore, as someone resembling the angel Michael in 1QM, who is the heavenly warrior on behalf of God and the leader of the sons of light. These fight in heaven against the sons of darkness, the wicked angels lead by Belial; cf. L.J. Lietaert Peerbolte, *Antichrist*, pp. 258-261. 4Q246 does not give a description of the expectation of a coming heavenly eschatological agent either. One of the (many) things which remain unclear in this fragment is whether or not the person named 'Son of God' and 'Son of the Most High' (ii, 1) is a heavenly figure. Furthermore, it is also unclear whether this person is the subject of the verbs in ii, 5-9.

in the writings discussed above. At this point the problem of explaining the origin of the concept of Jesus' coming at the end of time becomes clear. The difficulty lies in the fact that there are no parallel ideas which can be dated with certainty to the thirties of the first century C.E. or earlier. The most one can do seems to be to point to analogous Jewish concepts from a later but not too distant period of time.

There are sound reasons to assume, however, that the ideas concerning the coming heavenly eschatological agent, which can be detected in the Jewish writings mentioned above, represent a common tradition. It is even possible to reconstruct this tradition. It is also possible to make a reasonable case for the supposition that this Jewish tradition existed in the time when Christians began to expect the second coming of Jesus. Once the existence of this tradition in the first half of the first century C.E. (or earlier) is proven, one may assume that it is the root from which the expectation of Jesus' coming at the end of time originated. There are conspicuous agreements between the concept of the coming heavenly eschatological agent transmitted in Jewish tradition (Sib. Or. 5; 4 Ezra; 1 Enoch 37-71; 2 Apoc. Bar.), on the one hand, and the concept of Jesus' parousia, on the other. By recognizing these agreements, one can argue that the concept of Jesus' future parousia derives from, amongst others, that very tradition.

The tradition underlying the concept of the coming heavenly eschatological agent in Sib. Or. 5, 4 Ezra, 1 Enoch 37-71, and 2 Apoc. Bar. is that of the 'Son of Man'. In at least three of the four writings—Sib. Or. 5, 4 Ezra, and 1 Enoch 37-71—the presence of the tradition of the Son of Man can be demonstrated.[1] Despite the fact that in these three writings the tradition of the Son of Man is connected with other traditions concerning eschatological saviours,[2] the Jewish Son of Man tradition can still be (partially) reconstructed on the basis of the agreements between the three writings mentioned. Furthermore, there is at least one older writing in which this tradition occurs in an early form of its development, namely, Daniel 7.

In their use of the Son of Man tradition the three Jewish works mentioned above agree in the following respects. Firstly, in 1 Enoch 37-71 the eschatological agent is named 'Son of Man' and in Sib. Or. 5 and 4 Ezra 'man' (*homo*, ἀνήρ). The latter term can be considered to

---

[1] Although the concept of the eschatological agent in 2 Apoc. Bar. agrees with that found in Sib. Or. 5, 4 Ezra, and 1 Enoch 37-71, 2 Apoc. Bar. does not use the title or phrase Son of Man. It is therefore safer not to use 2 Apoc. Bar. for reconstructing the (Jewish) tradition of the Son of Man. The other three witnesses will suffice anyway.

[2] For instance, the tradition of the messiah.

be a normal translation of the phrase Son of Man.[1] Secondly, in all three writings the eschatological agent (Son of Man) comes from heaven or the celestial realm, travelling through the sky.[2] Thirdly, the actions of the eschatological agent (Son of Man) are presented as predominantly those of a warrior and, to a lesser extent, of a judge.[3] These agreements warrant the conclusion that the concept of the coming heavenly eschatological agent in these writings is based on common tradition, namely, the tradition of the Son of Man. The origin of this tradition lies in an earlier writing: the book of Daniel. Chapter 7 of this book introduces a 'son of man'[4] who travels through the sky[5] and who acts as a warrior and a judge.[6]

---

[1] In Aramaic, in which the earliest passage attesting the tradition of the Son of Man is transmitted (Dan. 7:13), the phrase Son of Man (*bar enash*, בר אנש) means 'man', 'someone', or 'mankind'. Words like *homo*, *vir*, and ἀνήρ are therefore accurate translations. In Sib. Or. 5:414 the heavenly agent is called 'blessed man' (ἀνὴρ μακαρίτης). The word ἀνήρ is used here as an indefinite personal pronoun equivalent to τὶς, 'someone blessed', or 'a blessed man', comparable with ἀνὴρ τύραννος = a tyrant; R. Kühner, B. Gerth, *Grammatik*, vol. II, i, pp. 271-273. The word ἀνήρ, then, is a perfect translation of the Aramaic *bar enash*. In 1 Enoch 37-71, the heavenly agent is called 'Son of Man', 'Son of Men', or 'Son of Humankind' (for the passages, see J. Theisohn, *Richter*, p. 32). In the Syriac version of 4 Ezra 13:3 the heavenly agent is first called 'something like the figure of a man' (ܕܡܘܬ ܓܒܪܐ) and then in the same verse referred to as 'man' (ܓܒܪܐ). In the Latin version the first phrase ('something like the figure of a man') is missing due to homoeoarkton (see above, p. 104, note 6); the second phrase ('man') is rendered as *homo*.

[2] In Sib. Or. 5:414 he comes down from the heavenly realm (νῶτα οὐρανίων) to earth. In 4 Ezra 13:3 the heavenly agent travels by flying on the clouds (*convolabat cum nubibus caeli*). The Man's coming from the (heart of the) sea does not mean that he actually departs from the sea (and not from heaven). The sea refers here to the hiddenness of the Man and the impossibility of knowing when he will come (see 4:7; 13:52; M.E. Stone, *Fourth Ezra*, p. 406). The fact that he is said to be accompanied (13:52)—namely, by celestial beings—is another sign that he will descend from heaven. According to 1 Enoch 37-71 the heavenly agent will 'appear' (38:2; 53:6; 69:29; cf. 51:5) from heaven where he dwells until the time of his appearance has come. Although his coming (traveling) to earth from heaven is not explicitly mentioned, it is clear that he will move from heaven to earth (see above).

[3] In Sib. Or. 5:414-419 the heavenly agent (ἀνήρ) holds a scepter in his hands with which he rules the earth, destroying all evil nations and cities and restoring justice for the people of God. In 4 Ezra 13:1-13 the heavenly agent (*homo*) destroys all nations with the breath and words of his mouth, whereafter he assembles the people of God. In 1 Enoch 37-71 the eschatological agent (Son of Man) passes judgement, destroys the sinners, and establishes a glorious time on earth (see, for instance, 69:26-29).

[4] 'I saw one like a human being (כבר אנש) coming with the clouds of heaven' (Dan. 7:13).

[5] In Dan. 7:13 it seems as if the Son of Man goes up to heaven instead of going down, since he is 'presented' before the 'Ancient One' who is earlier described as sitting on his heavenly throne (7:9). Although the direction of the movement is not clear, the 'son of man' does travel through the sky on the clouds; cf. J.J. Collins, *Daniel. A*

It is unlikely, however, that the authors of Sib. Or. 5, 4 Ezra, and 1 Enoch 37-71, when speculating about the coming Son of Man, draw directly on Daniel 7. There is at least one major difference between the Son of Man concept in Daniel 7, on the one hand, and that in Sib. Or. 5, 4 Ezra, and 1 Enoch 37-71, on the other, which makes a direct relationship unlikely. The difference is that in Sib. Or. 5, 4 Ezra, and 1 Enoch 37-71 the Son of Man is one single person, whereas in Daniel 7 the Son of Man is a collective figure; a symbol standing for the people of God, Israel.[1] It is improbable that three authors independently interpreted the collective Son of Man in Daniel 7 as an individual. This essential difference forces one to postulate a phase of the tradition lying between the concept of the Son of Man in Daniel 7 and the use of the tradition of the Son of Man in 1 Enoch 37-71, 4 Ezra, and Sib. Or. 5.[2] In this intermediate phase the originally collective Son of Man was transformed into an individual Son of Man. This is at least one of the alterations which the tradition of the Son of Man[3] underwent in this early phase of its transmission.[4] Chronologically, this phase must be

---

Commentary on the Book of Daniel (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993), p. 311.

6 Although the author of Daniel 7 portrays the Son of Man as remaining rather passive, he still ascribes to him dominion and kingship so that all nations will serve him (7:14).

1 In the angel's explanation of the vision, the Son of Man is identified with 'the (people of the) holy ones of the Most High' (Dan. 7:22, 27).

2 See H.J. de Jonge, 'The Historical Jesus' View of Himself and his Mission', in: M.C. de Boer (ed.), *From Jesus to John. Essays on Jesus and New Testament Christology in Honour of Marinus de Jonge* (JSNT.S 84; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993), pp. 30-32. Coming from a different perspective, J.J. Collins also assumes such an intermediate phase of the tradition of the Son of Man. He argues that 'the correspondences between 4 Ezra and the Similitudes of Enoch point to common assumptions about the interpretation of Daniel 7 in first century Judaism.' He is reluctant to call these 'common assumptions' a 'Son of Man' concept, but does regard it to be 'reasonable' to suppose that these 'common assumptions were also shared by others in first century Judaism'; J.J. Collins, 'Son of Man', pp. 465-466; cf. J.C. VanderKam, 'Righteous One', p. 188; B. Slater, 'One like a Son of Man in First-Century C.E. Judaism', *NTS* 41 (1995), pp. 183-198.

3 Another alteration was perhaps the explicit mention of the descent of the Son of Man. Because the Son of Man was a heavenly figure just resembling a human being, his movement was interpreted explicitly as a movement from heaven to earth.

4 How this phase of the tradition of the Son of Man originated, that is, how the collective Son of Man in Daniel 7 came to be interpreted as an individual, cannot be ascertained. Probably the Son of Man vision in Daniel 7 was interpreted in a 'messianic' way. In accordance with ideas concerning the messiah as an eschatological intermediary, the Son of Man may have come to be seen as God's eschatological intermediary. This 'messianic' interpretation of the Son of Man would primarily be based on the vision (Dan. 7:9-14), less so on the interpretation of the vision (7:15-28) which explains the Son of Man as a symbol standing for God's people, Israel. The supposition that a con-

placed after the composition of the book of Daniel but before the time when Sib. Or. 5, 4 Ezra, and 1 Enoch 37-71 originated (i.e., the second half of the first century C.E.). Thus, it must have existed in the first half of the first century C.E., the time in which also the concept of Jesus' coming at the end of time arose.

Not only did the expectation of Jesus' coming in the future arise when Jews already expected the coming of the Son of Man. There are also striking agreements between the Jewish concept of the appearance of the individual Son of Man and the earliest traceable concept of the coming of Jesus.[1] It is plausible, therefore, that the Christian expectation of Jesus' (second) coming derives from the Jewish tradition concerning the coming of the individual Son of Man.

(4) This conclusion is corroborated, of course, by the fact that in Mark and Q the title Son of Man is also used for the coming Jesus. All the passages in Mark and four of the five passages in Q that mention Jesus' coming at the end of time speak about the coming Jesus as the coming Son of Man. The use of the title Son of Man by Mark and Q has elicited an enormous amount of publications.[2] One of the issues constantly discussed is the fact that Mark and Q make Jesus persistently refer to the Son of Man in the third person singular, as if the Son of Man was another person than Jesus, whereas it is absolutely clear that they regard the Son of Man to be identical with Jesus.[3]

Several scholars have attempted to solve this riddle by arguing that the phrase Son of Man was originally used neither as a title nor derived from the Jewish tradition of the coming Son of Man as sketched above. Instead, they argue that in Aramaic—the language in which Jesus must have used the phrase—'son of man' means nothing else than 'someone'. On the basis of the use of the phrase son of man in Aramaic writings, these scholars regard the phrase son of man as a synonym of 'I', or of

---

cept of a coming heavenly eschatological intermediary could arise on the basis of Daniel 7 is not unreasonable when one considers the great number of current concepts of eschatological saviours and intermediaries, such as that of Michael and Melchizedek as the heavenly warrior fighting in heaven against the hosts of the enemies (1QM; 11QMelch.). The concept of Michael as the heavenly warrior is also based on the book of Daniel.

[1] The agreements between the Jewish individual Son of Man and the early Christian Son of Man are that they are both expected to descend from heaven and to proceed as a ruler and judge.

[2] For a review of some of the literature on the topic, see the literature mentioned in the section on the history of research into 1 Corinthians 15, p. 28, note 2.

[3] In Mark and Q, not only the sayings about the eschatological coming and activity of the Son of Man, but also those about his terrestrial activity and those about his death and resurrection, are phrased in the third person and placed in the mouth of Jesus.

'anyone' (generically), used by the speaker to make a general statement about mankind and, in particular, about himself or a special group of people.[1] Two major arguments have been brought against these ideas. First of all, the Aramaic evidence is not conclusive and too late.[2] Secondly, if the phrase 'son of man' was simply a synonym of 'man' or 'someone', it remains unexplained why translators rendered it so awkwardly in Greek as to change the generic meaning of the phrase ('man' or 'someone') into a specific one, namely, *the* Son of Man, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.[3] The word ἀνήρ in the function of an indefinite pronoun (= τίς)[4] would have been a more adequate translation. This would express the generic meaning of the Aramaic phrase much better.

Moreover, the decisive character of the phrase 'the Son of Man' (with a definite article) shows that the phrase was used with a particular meaning, referring to a particular idea or concept. According to A. Yarbro Collins this particular meaning alluded directly to Dan. 7:13, an allusion intended by the original speaker of these sayings, namely, (the historical) Jesus.[5] Yarbro Collins is correct in seeing in the definite character of the phrase 'the Son of Man' an indication that it referred to a specific, fixed, traditional concept of 'the Son of Man'. However, the reference cannot be directly linked to Dan. 7:13. Just as in Sib. Or. 5, 4 Ezra, and 1 Enoch 37-71, in Mark and Q the term 'Son of Man' denotes an individual, whereas in Daniel 7 it is used for a collective. The Son of Man concept in Mark and Q cannot go back directly to Daniel 7. Between Daniel and Mark/Q an intermediate stage of the tradition has to be postulated. In this stage the expected Son of Man came to be seen as an individual eschatological saviour. This very same phase of the tradition has to be postulated, as was argued above, to explain the tradition of an individual Son of Man in Sib. Or. 5, 4

---

[1] For a review of these attempts, see J.R. Donahue, 'Studies', pp. 486-490; for a recent defence of this view, see M. Casey, 'Idiom and Translation: Some Aspects of the Son of Man Problem', *NTS* 41 (1995), pp. 164-182.

[2] J.A. Fitzmyer, *A Wandering Aramean. Collected Aramaic Essays* (SBL.MS 25; Chico: Scholars Press, 1979), pp. 143-160.

[3] A. Yarbro Collins, 'Daniel 7 and the Historical Jesus', in: H.W. Attridge, J.J. Collins, T.H. Tobin (eds.), *Of Scribes and Scrolls. Studies on the Hebrew Bible, Intertestamental Judaism, and Christian Origins presented to John Strugnell* (Lanham/New York/London: University Press of America, 1990), pp. 187-193; cf. C.F.D. Moule, *The Origin of Christology* (Cambridge/London/New York/Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 1977), pp. 12-13.

[4] See above, p. 109, note 1.

[5] A. Yarbro Collins, 'Daniel 7', p. 190.

Ezra, and 1 Enoch 37-71.[1] The definite article of the phrase 'the Son of Man' (ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου), then, refers to the concept of the individual Son of Man who was expected to come at the end of time. The Jewish tradition concerning the individual Son of Man is a much more plausible background for the rise of the (apocalyptic) Son of Man sayings than the possible Aramaic use of the phrase Son of Man as a generic expression.

The title Son of Man for the coming Jesus is used in Mark and Q, but not in Paul. In the Pauline epistles there are no sayings about the Son of Man of any category whatsoever.[2] This can be explained either by arguing that the title has been deliberately left out by Paul or by arguing that the title is a secondary feature in the concept of Jesus' coming at the end of time just like the term παρουσία is. What is clear, however, is that the concept of Jesus' parousia in Paul is based on the tradition of the Son of Man, even though he does not use the title. There is no other Jewish (or pagan) tradition which can serve as an alternative to explain the expectation of Jesus' coming at the end of time in Paul.

The view that the title is deliberately omitted in Paul's writings is often underpinned by pointing to the fact that the title in its Greek form is difficult to understand, especially for a pagan audience. For Greek-speaking people who were unfamiliar with the expression in its Semitic form, the Greek phrase, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, as a rendering of the Aramaic (א)נש בר (someone), was probably pointless. The Greek words 'the son of the man' cannot function as a title of dignity unless the hearers already know beforehand that the words have this function. For that reason Paul may have avoided the title, even without replacing it by any other christological title.

The alternative view, namely, that the title is missing in Paul because the title is secondary, can be sustained by arguing that Paul's letters are older than the gospel of Mark and possibly also older than the source Q. Paul's terminology for the concept of Jesus' parousia may therefore be less developed. It is possible that in the earliest concept of Jesus' parousia the title Son of Man was not used. The author of Q, too, can speak about the coming of Jesus without using the title Son of Man (Matt. 23:39/Luke 13:35). However, one must not dismiss the use of

---

[1] The fact that the author of Mark quotes directly from Daniel 7 does not detract from this conclusion. The quotations belong clearly to a redactional level, and presuppose the identification of Jesus with the individual coming Son of Man.

[2] That is, none of the three categories of the Son of Man sayings that can be distinguished in Mark is represented in Paul.

the title Son of Man in Mark and Q as secondary too easily. While the two sources, or at least Mark, may be later than Paul's letters, it is nevertheless clear that the use of the title Son of Man goes back to Christian tradition older than Mark and Q. For instance, the saying in Mark 8:38 and Matt. 10:32-33/Luke 12:8-9 must go back to common, older tradition. It should also be noticed that it has frequently been argued that Jesus himself spoke about the coming Son of Man. This view must be refuted before one can take the use of the title Son of Man in Mark and Q to be secondary.[1]

Whether one argues that Paul deliberately avoided the title or that the use of the title for the coming Jesus arose secondarily, one should conclude, at least, that for expressing the expectation that Jesus would come at the end of time the title Son of Man was not indispensable. When speaking about Jesus' parousia Paul can do without the title, and so can the author of Q since he, too, speaks about Jesus' final coming without using the title Son of Man (Matt. 23:39/Luke 13:35).[2] But although the title was not a necessary element in the concept of Jesus' coming at the end of time, the concept itself must have its origin in the Jewish tradition of the coming Son of Man. No other Jewish or pagan tradition can explain the origin of this expectation.

(5) The tradition underlying the concept of Jesus' coming at the end of time is that of the individual coming Son of Man. On the basis of Sib. Or. 5, 4 Ezra, and 1 Enoch 37-71, on the one hand, and Daniel 7, on the other, one can reconstruct a phase of the tradition concerning the Son of Man which spoke about him as an individual eschatological agent, who would come as a judge and ruler on behalf of God in order to save the righteous ones. This tradition must have existed in first century C.E. Judaism. From this tradition the idea that Jesus would come at the end of time must have originated. Mark and Q even speak about the coming Jesus as the coming Son of Man, although this title need not necessarily be taken to have belonged to the earliest tradition concerning Jesus' parousia. The possibility cannot be ruled out, however, that in the expectation of Jesus' second coming the term 'Son of Man' figured from the outset.

---

[1] Whether the historical Jesus spoke about the coming Son of Man, and, if so, whether in reference to himself or to another, will be discussed below.

[2] It is noteworthy that the author of 2 Apoc. Bar. also speaks about a coming heavenly eschatological agent without using the title Son of Man; see above, pp. 106-107.

c. *The rise of the expectation of Jesus' parousia*

(1) The concept of Jesus' coming at the end of time is based on the Jewish tradition of the Son of Man. It remains to be explained why and when Jesus' followers started to believe in Jesus' parousia. The most simple answer, of course, is that Jesus himself predicted his return. The expectation of his coming in the future would then have originated during the time of Jesus' terrestrial activity. However, it is highly unlikely that the historical Jesus predicted his coming in the future.

First of all, nowhere in Paul, Mark, or Q is Jesus' coming at the end of time spoken of as a 'return' or as a 'coming again'. If Jesus himself had indeed predicted his coming he would have used such words as 'return', 'coming again', or 'coming a second time'. But in Mark and Q all sayings about the coming Son of Man speak about him as a person who is expected to arrive for the first time.

Furthermore, the sayings about the coming Son of Man are all placed in the mouth of Jesus in the third person singular. Jesus is presented as speaking about the Son of Man as a 'he'. That is, the Son of Man sayings suggest that the person Jesus expected to come was someone other than himself. Only in the context of the Gospels, owing to the Christological thrust of these documents, is the identification of the Son of Man with Jesus clear.

Many scholars reply that Jesus' use of the third person when speaking about the Son of Man is a hidden way of speaking about himself. However, it is most implausible that Jesus referred to himself as the coming Son of Man for, if he did, one has to assume that he foresaw and predicted his death, resurrection, and enthronement, as well as his return. The predictions of Jesus' death and resurrection recorded in Mark,[1] even if they were authentic, do not offer any support for this assumption. In none of these predictions is a reference to Jesus' coming as the Son of Man found. Jesus' death and resurrection, on the one hand, and his future coming as the Son of Man, on the other, are topics that remain unconnected in Mark.[2] In the source Q, the oldest docu-

---

[1] Mark 8:31; 9:31; 10:32-34.

[2] Some scholars have tried to argue that suffering (death) and exaltation (resurrection) were part of the Son of Man tradition. Consequently, they argue that Jesus' death and resurrection as Son of Man as well as his heavenly coming at the end of time belong to one and the same concept; G.W.E. Nickelsburg, 'Son of Man', *ABD*, vol. VI, pp. 137-150. However, such a concept of the Son of Man does not occur in the Jewish literature of the first century C.E.

ment attesting the Christian use of the title Son of Man, the title is never related to suffering and vindication.

One could perhaps object with the argument that Jesus identified himself with the coming Son of Man without supposing that he would first have to die and rise from the dead. After all, Q makes Jesus speak about his coming at the end of time, while omitting any references to his death and resurrection. The Q sayings about Jesus' future coming are therefore to be read as implying nothing with regard to his death and resurrection. Jesus, too, may have spoken about his future coming without taking into account a previous death. However, there is no reason why Jesus would speak about himself as someone who *would come in the future* while he was already present. The Son of Man would come from heaven (Mark 13:26), as lightning flashing through the sky (Matt. 24:27/Luke 17:24). He is supposed to come unexpectedly, like a thief in the night (Matt. 24:44/Luke 12:40). But Jesus *was already present,* and thus it was bizarre, if not impossible, for him to speak about himself as the *coming* Son of Man from heaven.[1] Again, Jesus could only speak about his future coming from heaven if he foresaw and predicted his future departure to heaven, either after a violent death or through a miraculous assumption, as well as his exaltation in glory. Such a complicated idea is without parallel. In short, whether or not the Son of Man sayings are authentic, in so far as they mention the coming of the Son of Man at the end of time, the person expected was originally someone other than Jesus. In other words, there are no indications that Jesus himself predicted his future coming in glory.

(2) If the historical Jesus did not foretell his future coming, then the expectation of Jesus' parousia must have taken shape among his followers in the time after his death. This conclusion raises the question *why* Jesus' followers started to believe that he would return at the end of time. In order to answer this question the situation of Jesus' followers in the time soon after his death has to be considered more closely.

Firstly, the movement stirred by Jesus during his terrestrial ministry was eschatologically inspired.[2] A central tenet in the belief of those belonging to the movement was the expectation that the reign of God was imminent. Jesus had announced that God's kingdom would definitively break through in the near future. He had also believed that this kingdom was already present in his own words and deeds. Within

---

[1] H.J. de Jonge, 'Wederkomst', pp. 12-13.

[2] See chapter V, p. 92.

the Jesus movement it was believed that God's reign was already rudimentarily present and that it would come in full in the near future.

Secondly, it is also reasonable to assume that Jesus' followers already attributed to him the title messiah, the anointed of the Lord, during his lifetime. The assumption that Jesus was already seen as the messiah in the time before his death is the logical consequence of the fact that the title was (still) used for Jesus after his death. This fact is sufficiently attested by the use of χριστός in Mark and in the letters of Paul. The latter uses the title (already) as a second name for Jesus. The very fact that the title was (still) used for Jesus after his death forces one to assume that it was already used for him before his death. It would be incomprehensible for Jesus' followers to start calling him the messiah after his death for, after Jesus had died, it was impossible for him to establish the kingship which the title messiah stands for; namely, the Davidic kingship.[1] The use of the title messiah after Jesus' death can only be explained by assuming that it was already used for him before his death. In other words, Jesus was already seen as messiah, and was called so, during his lifetime.[2] Besides, there are serious indications that Jesus' violent death was called forth by messianic claims concerning him, either voiced by Jesus or by his followers.[3]

The belief that God's reign was breaking through and that Jesus was becoming the king under this reign must have taken a severe blow when Jesus was put to death. Many people probably turned away from Jesus' movement in deep disappointment. Others, however, held on to the convictions which Jesus had evoked in them. Even after Jesus had died they went on believing that God would soon establish his reign in full. In defiance of Jesus' death these people continued to believe that the kingdom of God which Jesus had announced and inaugurated would come definitively very soon. But their expectations concerning the person of Jesus needed now to be adjusted. The adjustment took place

---

[1] N.A. Dahl, 'The Crucified Messiah', in: N.A. Dahl, *The Crucified Messiah and Other Essays* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1974), pp. 24-28; M. de Jonge, *Jesus*, pp. 62-72. Many scholars argue that Jesus came to be seen as the messiah exactly because of and through his death and exaltation. They hold that Jesus' exaltation became manifest through his appearances after his death (see the section on the history of research into 1 Corinthians 15, pp. 4, 8-9). But these scholars fail to take serious account of the traditional connection between the title messiah and the Davidic kingship in early Christian tradition. The notions of suffering and exaltation do not belong to the concept of the messiah; see M. de Jonge, 'Use', pp. 329-333. Furthermore, the idea of a heavenly messiah, such as Jesus would be in this case, did not develop until the late first century C.E. (4 Ezra, 2 Apoc. Bar.).

[2] This does not necessarily imply that Jesus saw himself as the messiah.

[3] M. de Jonge, *Jesus*, pp. 68-69.

spontaneously and smoothly. Before his death, Jesus' followers believed that Jesus would play a central role in the future kingdom of God. After his death, they still maintained the same belief, but they fashioned it in a different way. When the kingdom would come in full, Jesus would come as well and then complete the task which he had left unfinished as a result of his death. The one who had announced and inaugurated the kingdom would be there when the kingdom would become full reality. He would be present by descending from heaven, his residence since his resurrection. This idea of Jesus' coming at the end of time could arise because there existed certain expectations concerning eschatological agents who would come from heaven, especially the expectation of the coming Son of Man. Because Jesus was already perceived as the one with whom God's kingdom had started, those who kept looking forward to the definitive break-through of God's kingdom did so by expecting that the new aeon would be introduced by the apocalyptic Son of Man and by identifying that Son of Man with Jesus. As the coming Son of Man he would complete what he had already started during his lifetime on earth.[1]

In other words, the expectation that Jesus would come at the end of time to bring God's salvation was the natural result of two convictions: (a) the conviction that the full realization of God's kingdom was still imminent, and (b) the persuasion that the one who had inaugurated this kingdom would be present at its completion. The latter conviction was put into words with the aid of the existing tradition of the coming Son of Man, except that the Son of Man was now identified with Jesus.

(3) Attention must now be given to the question whether the tradition of the coming Son of Man was used only by followers of Jesus after his death or already by Jesus himself. As argued above, if Jesus spoke about the coming Son of Man he spoke about him in the third person. It is unlikely that when he mentioned the coming Son of Man he was referring to himself. But is it likely at all that he spoke about the coming Son of Man? Can any of the sayings about the coming Son of Man be taken to be authentic?[2]

---

[1] H.J. de Jonge, 'Wederkomst', pp. 24-27.

[2] Of all the sayings about the Son of Man only the apocalyptic ones on the coming Son of Man qualify for being considered as possibly authentic. Only these agree sufficiently with the apocalyptic Son of Man tradition. The other two groups of sayings, those about Jesus' terrestrial activity and those about his death and resurrection, are secondary. They were formed after Jesus had been identified with the coming Son of Man. The use of the title Son of Man was gradually extended so that it was eventually con-

In favour of the view that the historical Jesus did speak about the coming Son of Man, one can urge that these sayings are extremely old. They go back at least to a tradition older than the source Q.[1] Furthermore, at least one saying is attested by both Mark and Q (Mark 8:38 and Matt. 10:32-33/Luke 12:8-9).

Against this argument, however, is the objection that the title is completely missing in Paul's letters, which are the oldest Christian sources that have been preserved. If the historical Jesus spoke about the coming Son of Man, one would expect to find reminiscences of this teaching in Paul, especially since the designation Son of Man became a full-fledged Christological title in the gospels. Paul was either unacquainted with this title or he preferred not to use it.[2] But, in either case, Paul's passing over the title in silence does not support the view that the historical Jesus already spoke about the coming Son of Man.

A second argument used in favour of the authenticity of some of the sayings about the coming Son of Man is that all these sayings, although placed in the mouth of Jesus, are phrased in the third person singular. One would expect that the authors of Mark and the source Q, for whom the identification of Jesus with the coming Son of Man was a matter of course, would have made Jesus speak about the Son of Man in the first person. In that way the identification of Jesus with the Son of Man would be expressed more clearly, and it would also be sanctioned by Jesus himself. Yet, the authors of Mark and Q did not go so far as to bring the identification of Jesus and the Son of Man to expression in the grammar of the Son of Man sayings. This, it is argued, may indicate the respect Mark and Q had for the sayings in the form handed down to them. This form, it is then concluded, must be primitive and can be ascribed to Jesus himself. Consequently, Jesus spoke about the Son of Man, although he did not use the phrase to refer to himself.

This argument, however, is open to the objection that, when the Synoptic Gospels make Jesus use a Christological title, they make him do this *always* in the third person. In Mark, for instance, Jesus never

---

nected with Jesus' person in all stages of his earthly ministry; H.E. Tödt, *Menschensohn*, pp. 204-257, 265-267.

[1] The fact that these sayings are found in both Mark and Q indicates that they derive from a common, older tradition. Moreover, the setting of these sayings in Q presupposes a pre-Q stage of the coming Son of Man sayings. The identification of Jesus with the Son of Man, for instance, is redactional in Q. This shows that the author adopted these sayings from tradition. Cf. D. Lührmann, *Logienquelle*, pp. 40-41, note 6; C.M. Tuckett, 'The Son of Man in Q', in: M.C. de Boer (ed.), *From Jesus to John*, pp. 195-215.

[2] See above, pp. 113-114.

speaks about himself as the messiah or the Son of God in the first person.[1] Furthermore, the capacity of the coming Son of Man is a dignity which Jesus could not assume until after his resurrection and exaltation. It is therefore quite imaginable that the ones writing about Jesus' terrestrial life found it difficult to make the historical Jesus speak about himself in such a way as to suggest that he was already invested with the office of Son of Man. In order to avoid confusion between his earthly and future (eschatological) dignities they may have preferred to make Jesus speak about the coming Son of Man in an indirect way—namely, in the third person—with the meaning, nevertheless, that this coming Son of Man would be Jesus.[2] In other words, the use of the third person in the Son of Man sayings need not necessarily be taken as a sign that these sayings are authentic; it can also be the effect of an editorial, redactional strategy. In that case these sayings have to be considered secondary and can no longer be taken as evidence that the Son of Man was a topic in the teaching of Jesus himself.

A third ground on which the view that the historical Jesus spoke about the coming Son of Man is based is the argument of continuity. The fact that Jesus' followers, in order to express their expectation of Jesus' parousia, could easily make use of the apocalyptic tradition of the Son of Man would be an indication that Jesus himself used this tradition. According to those who argue this, there must have been at least some continuity between the ideas of Jesus' followers before and after his death. If Jesus' followers knew of the coming Son of Man after his death, they argue, it is probable that they also knew of the Son of Man before Jesus' death. Consequently, Jesus himself may have known of the coming Son of Man, too. Moreover, if Jesus himself knew of and spoke about the coming Son of Man, it is all the more understandable why, after his death, Jesus' followers identified Jesus with this coming Son of Man.

---

[1] Compare, for instance, the way Mark makes Jesus speak about the messiah (ὁ χριστός) and the Son of David in Mark 12:35-37. In Mark 13:32 Jesus speaks about himself as 'the Son' (ὁ υἱός), which is also in the third person. In Mark 14:62 Jesus does admit that he is the messiah but he does not speak about the messiah, in the first person. There he allows others to call him the messiah; cf. Mark 15:39.

[2] For those who created the (pre-Q and pre-Mark) apocalyptic Son of Man sayings, the dignity denoted by the title Son of Man was so exalted that they tried to prevent it from being associated with the terrestrial Jesus. In their view there was a sharp distinction between Jesus' terrestrial and heavenly offices. However, for the authors of Q and Mark who took over the identification of the Son of Man with Jesus from earlier tradition, it was no longer necessary to maintain this distinction so strictly. They expanded the use of the title Son of Man so as to connect it with Jesus' suffering and death, as well as his preaching and further terrestrial activity.

This argument is highly questionable, too. As already noticed above, the historical Jesus is unlikely to have spoken about himself as someone who *would come* since he was already present.[1] If Jesus is supposed to have spoken of a coming Son of Man, he must therefore have meant someone else, not himself. Yet, as was also expounded above, from some point in his life on earth Jesus was seen as the future messiah, the ideal, Davidic king in a glorious Israel to come. Now if the historical Jesus was seen as the messiah of the future, it is not very likely that he or his followers during his lifetime expected also another eschatological agent. It is almost inconceivable that a messiah whose identity was already known and a future, coming Son of Man would both figure significantly in one and the same eschatological view of the future.[2] Only after Jesus' death, when it was clear that he would not become a messianic, Davidic king of Israel, was it possible to make use of the tradition of the coming Son of Man and to apply this tradition to Jesus. Only then was it possible to identify the coming Son of Man with Jesus who, as a result, was expected to come back from heaven in the near future.

All in all, it seems more likely that the historical Jesus did not speak about the coming Son of Man. All arguments in favour of the view that his teaching included utterances about the Son of Man—the antiquity of some of the Son of Man sayings, their being phrased in the third person, and the supposed continuity between the situation of Jesus' followers before and after his death—can be contested. The title is missing in Paul, the use of the third person does not necessarily imply authenticity, and the argument of continuity speaks against rather than in favour of the view that Jesus spoke about the coming Son of Man.

(4) This section (c) can be summarized as follows. The expectation of Jesus' coming at the end of time arose after Jesus' death as a result of the persistent belief of his followers in the coming of God's kingdom and Jesus' place in that kingdom. With the help of the tradition of the Son of Man, Jesus' followers came to regard Jesus as the one who would come from heaven at the end of time, God's eschatological agent who would definitively introduce God's reign. They identified him as the Son of Man, since he was already viewed during his life as the one

---

[1] See pp. 115-116.

[2] This is only conceivable if the two were seen as one and the same person. But if Jesus spoke about the coming Son of Man, he must have referred to someone else. Cf. E. Lohse, *Grundriß der neutestamentlichen Theologie* (ThW 5; Stuttgart/Berlin/Köln/Mainz: W. Kohlhammer, ²1979), p. 48.

who had inaugurated the kingdom of God. The one with whom it all began would come again to complete what had begun. The identification of Jesus with the coming Son of Man took place after he had died. It seems unlikely that, already before he had died, Jesus or his followers expected the coming Son of Man or spoke about him.

VII. THE ORIGIN OF THE IDEA OF THE ESCHATOLOGICAL RESURRECTION COINCIDING WITH JESUS' COMING

On the basis of the results reached in the two previous chapters, an attempt will now be made to explain how the idea originated that the eschatological resurrection will take place at the time of Jesus' parousia (1 Cor. 15:23). Not only will an explanation be advanced as to how this idea arose (section a), but the rise of this idea will also be placed in the context of the development of analogous ideas in first century C.E. Judaism (section b).

a. *The rise of the idea that the eschatological resurrection will take place at the time of Jesus' parousia*

(1) In chapter VI the view was defended that the expectation of Jesus' coming at the end of time originated soon after Jesus' death. Previously, in chapter V, it had been argued that the Christian expectation of the eschatological resurrection was part of the Christians' belief from the outset since it was already the expectation of Jesus' followers during his lifetime. Consequently, it is reasonable to infer that the younger expectation—that Jesus will come at the end of time—was added and linked to the older one, the expectation of the eschatological resurrection. Both expectations have to do with the events of the last day. It does not come as a great surprise, therefore, that at one stage the two ideas came to be connected. As soon as the expectation of Jesus' coming at the end of time arose, it could be and perhaps was linked to the already existing expectation of the eschatological resurrection.[1]

However, the evidence seems to suggest that this connection was not advocated until Paul wrote his letters to the Thessalonians (1 Thess. 4:16-17) and the Corinthians (1 Cor. 15:23). Apparently, as is clear from Paul's letters, the connection of the two expectations was not a necessary, unavoidable one. Christians could speak about the one without referring to the other. Paul himself did this repeatedly. Thus, al-

---

[1] Cf. W. Marxsen, 'Auslegung', pp. 27-29. This view is supported by several passages in Paul in which he presupposes a link between the eschatological resurrection and Christ's second coming without mentioning this link explicitly. See, e.g., 2 Cor. 5:10, Phil. 3:20-21, and Rom. 14:10; cf. chapter IV, pp. 71-75.

though theoretically speaking the two expectations may have been associated with each other as soon as the younger one (that of Jesus' parousia) arose, the relationship between the two was not put into words until Paul did so in 1 Thess. 4:14-16 and 1 Cor. 15:23.

The examination of Paul's ideas in 1 Thess. 4:14-16 and 1 Cor. 15:23 earlier in this study brought to light that Paul had very specific reasons there to write what he wrote: he wanted to comfort the grieving Thessalonians and to remedy the Corinthians' misconception about the future resurrection.[1] Apparently, these two passages are the only ones in which Paul had reason to make explicit what people may have assumed long before; namely, that the eschatological resurrection would take place at the time of Jesus' second coming.

In both 1 Thess. 4:13-18 and 1 Corinthians 15 Paul uses the theme of Jesus' coming in the future to recommend the belief in the echatological resurrection. It is clear why Paul proceeds in this way. The Thessalonians were not adequately informed about the coming resurrection, but they were familiar with the idea of the second coming of Jesus. Therefore, Paul starts from the idea of Jesus' coming, which had already been accepted by his addressees, and attaches to it the idea of the eschatological resurrection, which had not yet been accepted by them. In 1 Corinthians 15 Paul's procedure is the same. His point of departure is the expectation of Jesus' coming, an idea shared by the Corinthian addressees. To this concept he attaches the idea of the eschatological resurrection, an idea disputed by them. In Paul's argumentation the eschatological resurrection is thus appended to the future coming of Jesus. Traditio-historically, however, the eschatological resurrection is an older idea than that of the future coming of Jesus. Whenever the two ideas appear in combination, the idea of Jesus' coming must therefore be regarded as added, and attached to the resurrection on the last day. In Paul's rhetorical presentation of these ideas they are arranged in an order (second coming + eschatological resurrection) opposite to the way they came to be connected in the history of tradition (eschatological resurrection + second coming).

(2) Paul makes the eschatological resurrection and the coming of Jesus coincide. In doing so he systematizes Christian expectations concerning the end of time that were originally unconnected and uncoordinated. By connecting the moment of the eschatological resurrection to that of

---

[1] See chapter IV, pp. 69-71.

Jesus' parousia, Paul creates part of a scenario for the events of the end of time. He produces order from disparate traditions.

b. *Analogies in Jewish eschatology of the Graeco-Roman period*

(1) In the previous section the rise of the idea that the eschatological resurrection will take place at the time of Jesus' coming has been explained exclusively from processes and developments within early Christianity. It may be worthwile to ask as well, however, whether the rise of the idea at issue can be understood in the light of non-Christian, Jewish traditions.

A clear parallel of the idea that the eschatological resurrection will take place at the time of Jesus' coming in glory does not seem to present itself in the Jewish literature from the Graeco-Roman period. In Jewish writings the expectation of the eschatological resurrection and that of the coming of the heavenly eschatological agent are rarely associated. When they are connected, this is accomplished in a way different from that in 1 Cor. 15:23 and 1 Thess. 4:16-17.

Nevertheless, certain Jewish views of the eschatological resurrection can be seen as the outcome of a development similar to that underlying 1 Cor. 15:23-28 and 1 Thess. 4:13-18. This development is the systemization of originally disparate traditions. Just like Paul, several Jewish writers tried to offer their readers a systematic account of the events to come, including the eschatological resurrection. They attempted to link the expectation of the eschatological resurrection to other eschatological expectations. As a result, the expectation of the eschatological resurrection in some writings came to be connected one way or another to the expectation of the heavenly eschatological agent. However, nowhere in Jewish literature is the expectation of the eschatological resurrection related to the expectation of the coming of the eschatological heavenly agent in terms of time, as they are in Paul.

(2) In examining the passages in Jewish literature in which the idea of the bodily eschatological resurrection occurs,[1] one observes that in some instances (4Q521, frg. 2 ii, 12; frg. 7 ii, 6; Apoc. Mos. 13:3; Job

[1] Dan. 12:2; Job 42:17(LXX); 1 Enoch 91:10; 4Q385, frg. 2; 4Q521, frg. 2 ii, 12; frg. 7 ii, 6; Ps. Sol. 3:12; 1 Enoch 51:1-5; Sib. Or. 4:181-182; 2 Apoc. Bar. 21:23-24; 30:1-2; 42:7-8; 50:2-4; 4 Ezra 7:32; Apoc. Mos. 13:3 (according to some MSS; cf. M. Nagel, *Adam*, vol. III, p. 85); 41:2 (10:2; 28:4); Bib. Ant. 3:10; T. Job 4:9; see chapter V, pp. 85-87.

42:17 (LXX); T. Job 4:9; 1 Enoch 91:10; Ps. Sol. 3:11-12) the eschatological resurrection is simply presented as one of the wonders belonging to the salvation which the righteous ones will receive at the end of time. In 4Q521, frg. 2 ii, 12 and frg. 7 ii, 6, for example, the resurrection of the dead is one among many glorious goods with which God[1] will reward the righteous ones.[2] The raising of the dead always implies reward or vindication. Raising always has the connotation of justification, even if the idea of God's final judgement is not involved. In 1 Enoch 91:10, for instance, the mention of the future resurrection of the righteous ones immediately follows the mention of the destruction of the sinners (v. 9). In Ps. Sol. 3:11-12 the fate of the righteous ones and the fate of the sinners are contrasted in a still more telling way: when people die, the destruction of the sinners is for ever (v. 11), but those who fear the Lord will rise up to eternal life (ἀναστήσονται εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον, v. 12). Thus, the future resurrection is viewed as a reward which the righteous ones will receive in contradistinction to the unrighteous ones.

In another group of writings (Sib. Or. 4:181-184; Bib. Ant. 3:10) the idea of the eschatological resurrection is explicitly connected to that of God's final judgement. In these writings the resurrection is the introduction to the judgement. People are raised to be judged. The background of this concept of resurrection is the idea that all people must be judged and, therefore, all people who have died must be raised, not only the righteous but also the unrighteous. In the end, all people, good and evil, will be reckoned with according to their deeds. For that reason all people, good and evil, will be raised.

---

[1] The raising of the dead in 4Q521 is accomplished by God himself, not by the eschatological agent mentioned a few lines above, as has been suggested by others; see J.J. Collins, 'The Works of the Messiah', *DSD* 1 (1994), pp. 94-112. The author does not mention any action which the eschatological agent will undertake. The one who brings about the eschatological wonders described in lines 5-14 (frg. 2 ii) is God. This is also explicitly stated by the author in lines 5 and 11. There is no reason to assume a sudden change of subject between lines 11 and 12, as Collins proposes. Furthermore, in frg. 7 ii, lines 4-6 of the same document, the resurrection is said to be brought about by God. Collins' main argument in support of his view that it is the eschatological agent (in his opinion a prophetic messiah) who will raise the dead is that the only person of whom it can be said that he will 'preach good news to the poor,' as it is said in the same line (line 12), is an eschatological agent or prophetic messiah. However, this argument does not counter-balance the arguments adduced above.

[2] The idea that the eschatological resurrection is part of the salvation which the righteous ones will receive at the end of time is also found in Apoc. Mos. 13:3; Job 42:17 (LXX) and T. Job 4:9 (cf. 53:10).

In Sib. Or. 4:181-192 it is said that God will raise mortals who have died and restore them to life. Subsequently, God's judgement will take place. Sinners will be destroyed and disappear from the earth, but the righteous ones will live again. Here the idea of the eschatological resurrection is closely related to that of the final judgement. In Bib. Ant. 3:10 the notions of resurrection and judgement are linked in a similar way. All people will be raised so that God can render to each according to his or her works.[1] In short, according to Sib. Or. 4:181-184 and Bib. Ant. 3:10 people will be raised so that they can be judged. The association of the ideas of resurrection and judgement betrays a tendency to systematize eschatological traditions.[2]

In four writings (Dan. 12:2-3; 2 Apoc. Bar. 30:1; 1 Enoch 51; 4 Ezra 7:26-44) the future resurrection is not only connected with the final judgement, but also with the activities of the eschatological intermediary. In Dan. 12:2-3, for instance, the resurrection immediately follows the final actions of Michael, the chief angel. Michael will appear and a last period of anguish will start, but Israel will be delivered from the tribulation. Finally, the resurrection will take place. Michael is 'the great prince', the 'protector' of Israel, the main heavenly warrior who fights a battle in heaven with the princes of Israel's enemies. This fight is the heavenly counterpart of the battle which will take place on earth.[3] As soon as the final battle is over, the dead will rise and be judged.[4] Michael is not a future, heavenly, eschatological agent

---

[1] At first sight it is unclear in 3:10 whether or not the author has a general resurrection and a general judgement in mind. However, from other passages it is evident that this must be the case. In 16:3, for instance, the author writes that, after their death, sinners will not die but will be stored away in darkness. When God will 'remember' the world, he will have them taken away for ever.

[2] The idea that the (souls of the) dead, both good and evil, will first be kept in 'storerooms' as mentioned in Bib. Ant. 3:10; 23:13; 26:13; 33:3-5, as well as in many other writings including 4 Ezra (7:32), shows that systematization also affected the theme of the eschatological resurrection itself. The idea that souls are kept in storerooms until the day of resurrection evolved, of course, out of a combination of the idea that the soul is immortal and the idea that people will be raised at the end of time. On the whole subject, see H. Sysling, *Techiyat ha-Metim. De opstanding van de doden in de Palestijnse Targumim op de Pentateuch en overeenkomstige tradities in de klassieke Rabbijnse bronnen* (Zutphen: Terra, 1991), pp. 187-209.

[3] See, for instance, Dan. 10:2-21. The presentation of Michael as the heavenly warrior is similar to that in the War Scroll (1QM) from Qumran; cf. J.J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Vision of the Book of Daniel* (HSM 16; Montana: Scholars Press, 1977), pp. 133-138.

[4] In Dan. 12:2-3 resurrection and judgement are presented as one event. Reward and punishment immediately follow the resurrection: 'many of those who sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt.'

belonging to the tradition from which the expectation of Jesus' coming in glory arose. He is nevertheless an eschatological intermediary and his actions affect the fate of Israel and, indirectly, the resurrection of the righteous and unrighteous ones. Dan. 12:1-3 is an early example of how expectations concerning the actions of an eschatological intermediary, the eschatological resurrection, and the final judgement are related to, and harmonized with, each other. The result is a more or less systematic presentation of the eschaton.

The eschatological events announced in 2 Apoc. Bar. 29-30 are as follows. First, the heavenly eschatological agent, here called messiah, will be revealed (29:3) and will inaugurate a glorious time on earth (29:5-8). Then, after the 'appearance of the Anointed One has been fulfilled and he returns with glory' (30:1), the resurrection will take place. According to chapters 50-51, the resurrection will be followed by the last judgement: sinners will be tormented and righteous ones will receive eternal glory.[1] The resurrection will take place after the appearance and activity of the eschatological agent; more precisely, at the moment of his departure from earth. There is a relationship between the activities of the coming, heavenly, eschatological agent and the eschatological resurrection, but this relationship is different from that between the actions of Christ and the resurrection in 1 Thess. 4:13-18 and 1 Cor. 15:23-28. In 2 Apoc. Bar. the resurrection takes place at the departure; in Paul it occurs at the arrival of the heavenly eschatological agent. Nevertheless, 2 Apoc. Bar. coordinates the expectation of the resurrection, that of the final judgement, and that of the activity of the eschatological agent, into one systematized structure.

A systematization of the expectation of the eschatological resurrection, the final judgement, and the coming, heavenly, eschatological agent is also found in 1 Enoch 37-71. The presentation of the eschatological resurrection in 1 Enoch 51 is perhaps the closest analogy to Paul's image of the resurrection in 1 Cor. 15:23 and 1 Thess. 4:14-16. In 1 Enoch 51 the eschatological resurrection is presented as taking place immediately before the eschatological agent takes his seat on a throne in order to pass judgement (1 Enoch 51:1-3). In this way the author creates a close relationship between the idea of the eschatological resurrection and the concept of the activity of the eschatological agent, in this case, his judicial activity. In 1 Enoch 51 the coming

[1] The conclusion that this resurrection is a general one, i.e., a resurrection of righteous ones and sinners, is confirmed by 2 Apoc. Bar. 50-51. In chapter 30 this remains somewhat unclear.

(appearance) of the eschatological agent is not explicitly mentioned. However, considering other passages in 1 Enoch 37-71, one must presume that this coming takes place.[1] This means that the idea of the eschatological resurrection and that of the coming of the heavenly eschatological agent are implicitly telescoped. Although the relationship between the two future events is not mentioned explicitly in 1 Enoch 51, as it is in Paul's letters, the relationship cannot be denied.

Finally, systematization also comes to light in the presentation of the eschatological events in 4 Ezra. Working more systematically than the authors of the writings mentioned above, the writer of 4 Ezra collects and combines different traditions concerning the eschatological events.[2] In 7:26-44 he gives this presentation of the last events: after a final time of disaster, the eschatological agent, called messiah in this passage, will be revealed and will establish a kingdom for 400 years in which all righteous ones will participate. Then everything and everyone, including the messiah, will die and seven days of complete silence will follow. Subsequently, all people will be raised and God will judge each according to his or her deeds. Sinners will be locked up in hell and righteous ones will enjoy an eternal life of delight and rest. This account clearly reflects a systematization of traditions on different eschatological events. In this presentation the expectation of the eschatological resurrection and the anticipation of the coming heavenly eschatological agent are to a certain extent related.[3] But the way they are related is quite different from the way they are connected in Paul. In 4 Ezra the activity of the eschatological agent and the eschatological resurrection are only two incidents in a long series of other events; the one does not affect the other.

In sum, Dan. 12:2-3, 2 Apoc. Bar. 30:1, 1 Enoch 51, and 4 Ezra 7:26-44 all show a certain tendency to systematize the expectations concerning the end of time, including that of the eschatological resurrection and that of the activity of the eschatological intermediary. In each writing the effect of this tendency is different. Three writings relate the idea of the eschatological resurrection to the notion of the coming, heavenly, eschatological agent. The various systematizations resemble the coordination between the eschatological resurrection and Jesus' parousia reflected in 1 Cor. 15:20-28 and 1 Thess. 4:16-17. Just

---

[1] See chapter VI, pp. 105-106, 106 note 2.

[2] Cf. M.E. Stone, *Fourth Ezra*, pp. 21-23.

[3] In the other descriptions of the activity of the eschatological agent in 4 Ezra (chapters 11-13), the eschatological resurrection is not mentioned.

like Paul, the authors of the above mentioned writings coordinated several eschatological expectations. The results of their systematizations may differ from that in Paul, but the procedure in all cases is essentially the same.

(3) The conclusions to be drawn from this section (b) are the following. First century C.E. Jewish literature offers no analogy to Paul's idea that the eschatological resurrection will take place at the time when the definitive, heavenly, eschatological agent will come. But the process which led to Paul's idea, that is, the process of systematizing the eschatological events into one eschatological scenario, is not without parallel. Several Jewish writings show that different eschatological expectations were related and coordinated into one systematic presentation of the events to come. The idea of the eschatological resurrection and the various ideas concerning the coming and activity of the heavenly eschatological agent were not exempt from this process of systematization. In 2 Apoc. Bar. 29-30, 1 Enoch 51, and 4 Ezra 7:26-44, the idea of the eschatological resurrection and the notion of the coming and activity of the heavenly eschatological agent are connected, although in a different construction than in Paul. The results of the systematization may vary in each case, but the process is the same in Jewish literature as it is in Paul. The phenomenon of systematization throws light on Paul's connection of the eschatological resurrection and Jesus' coming at the end of time. The rise of the idea that the eschatological resurrection will take place at the time of Jesus' parousia reflects a tendency to systematize the contents of different eschatological expectations that can also be observed in first century C.E. Judaism.

PART THREE

JESUS' RESURRECTION AS THE BEGINNING OF THE ESCHATOLOGICAL RESURRECTION

Part three of this study will offer a traditio-historical analysis of the idea that Jesus' resurrection is the beginning of the eschatological resurrection (1 Cor. 15:20). First, in chapter VIII, the idea itself will be studied. The passages which convey this idea, besides 1 Cor. 15:20, will be briefly analysed and compared with 1 Cor. 15:20. Secondly, in chapter IX, the origin of the belief in Jesus' resurrection will be examined. Such an inquiry is of the utmost importance for the traditio-historical analysis of the idea that Jesus' resurrection introduced the eschatological resurrection. Many scholars argue that the belief in Jesus' resurrection originated, in one way or another, from the tradition of the expectation of the eschatological resurrection. In their opinion, therefore, the idea that Jesus' resurrection is the beginning of the eschatological resurrection (1 Cor. 15:20) was a natural explication of the belief in Jesus' resurrection. This current view will be challenged here. It will be argued that the belief in Jesus' resurrection did not stem from the tradition of the eschatological resurrection, but from the tradition of the heavenly vindication of the martyr. Consequently, the idea that Jesus' resurrection is the beginning of the eschatological resurrection is a connection of two separate concepts of resurrection. Finally, in chapter X, the question of how these two concepts came to be connected in the idea that Jesus' resurrection formed the beginning of the eschatological resurrection will be answered.

VIII. THE IDEA OF JESUS' RESURRECTION AS THE BEGINNING OF THE ESCHATOLOGICAL RESURRECTION

(1) In chapter II it has been argued that Paul's view that Jesus was raised as the 'first-fruits (ἀπαρχή) of those who have fallen asleep' (1 Cor. 15:20) is worked out by him in two ways.[1] One of the two ways comes to the fore in verse 23, where the apostle suggests that the resurrection comprises two successive stages, each of which concerns a separate category of beneficiaries. The first category is formed by Jesus, who has already been raised. The second category consists of the Christians who will be raised at the end of time (v. 23). Thus, by calling Jesus the 'first-fruits of those who have fallen asleep,' Paul presents Jesus' resurrection as the beginning of the eschatological resurrection.

The idea that Jesus' resurrection formed the beginning of the eschatological resurrection does not appear elsewhere in Paul's letters. Many scholars, however, see a reference to this idea in Rom. 1:4, where Paul uses traditional language to describe the exaltation of Jesus: 'Declared to be Son of God with power according to the spirit of holiness by resurrection from the dead.'[2] But in this passage Paul does not relate Jesus' resurrection to the eschatological resurrection. Only the resurrection of Jesus is in view, not the eschatological resurrection. This is evident for three reasons. First, the preposition ἐξ in ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν has to be taken in a temporal sense; that is, in the sense of 'since', or 'from the time of ... onward.'[3] The alternative, which would understand the preposition to be causal, meaning 'on the basis of' or 'by', does not make sense since Jesus' resurrection is the manifestation, rather than the ground, of his exaltation and appointment as Son of God.[4] Jesus was believed to be exalted (through resurrection) *because of* what he had done during his terrestrial life, especially his innocent and voluntary death. Through his resurrection Jesus was installed as Lord, and this resurrection/exaltation is in no way related here to the

---

[1] See chapter II, pp. 49-51.

[2] See, for instance, U. Wilckens, *Römer*, vol. I, p. 65; E. Käsemann, *Römer*, p. 10; J.D.G. Dunn, *Romans 1-8* (WBC; Dallas: Word Books, 1988), pp. 15-16.

[3] H. Lietzmann, *An die Römer* (HNT; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1928), p. 25; C.E.B. Cranfield, *The Epistle to the Romans* (ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1975), vol. I, p. 62.

[4] H. Lietzmann, *Römer*, p. 25.

eschatological resurrection. Secondly, it is true that, in the traditional formulas about Jesus' resurrection,[1] the substantive νεκρῶν is normally preceded by the preposition ἐκ, whereas in Rom. 1:4 this ἐκ is missing. The absence of ἐκ does not necessarily mean, however, that the phrase ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν refers to the eschatological resurrection.[2] The preposition ἐκ may well have been left out because of the ἐξ preceding ἀναστάσεως. Finally, a reference to the eschatological resurrection does not fit into the passage. Paul is speaking about the risen Jesus as the exalted one; whether or not his resurrection has any connection with the eschatological resurrection is not a point of issue here.

(2) An idea somewhat related to Paul's view that Jesus has been raised as the 'first-fruits of those who have fallen asleep' occurs in Rom. 8:29. Here Paul says that God intended Jesus to be the 'firstborn' (πρωτότοκος) among many brothers. Jesus will be the firstborn when those 'who are called according to his purpose' (v. 28), the Christians, will be 'conformed to the image of his Son' (v. 29). The conformation to the image (εἰκών) of Jesus will result in the complete likeness of Christians to the glorified Jesus. They will attain this glory in the new aeon.[3] Apparently, Jesus' role as the firstborn (πρωτότοκος) consists in his being the image (εἰκών) to which all Christians will be transformed.[4] The conformation of the Christians to the image of Jesus will be accomplished in the age to come and then Jesus will be the firstborn. Thus, the idea that Jesus has been raised as the first one (ἀπαρχή), as Paul says in 1 Cor. 15:20, is different from the idea that Jesus will be the firstborn (πρωτότοκος), as he says in Rom. 8:29. The former concerns the order in which the resurrection takes place, whereas the latter bears upon the hierarchy which will exist in the aeon to come.

Although the hierarchical order will only be fully established in the age to come, Jesus himself has already obtained his superior position through his enthronement and exaltation as Lord and king.[5] The idea

---

[1] See chapter IX, pp. 139-142.

[2] See also Phil. 3:10 where Paul speaks about Jesus' resurrection again with the word ἀνάστασις; cf. 2 Macc. 7:14.

[3] The same idea occurs in 1 Cor. 15:49 and Phil. 3:21. In 2 Cor. 3:18 Paul presents this conformation as already having started.

[4] In Philo, too, the words πρωτότοκος and εἰκών are closely connected. Philo calls the λόγος the firstborn (πρωτότοκος) and the image (εἰκών) in whose likeness man and world were created. See F.-W. Eltester, *Eikon im Neuen Testament* (BZNW 23; Berlin: A. Töpelmann, 1958), pp. 34-36.

[5] See, for instance, Rom. 1:4; 10:9; 14:9; 1 Cor. 15:25; Phil. 2:6-11. The idea that Jesus has already obtained his leading position, on the one hand, whereas this position will

that Jesus will have the leading position among Christians in the age to come therefore presupposes his resurrection. Yet, in Rom 8:29 the idea that Jesus will have the leading position is not based on the conviction that he has been raised as the first one (1 Cor. 15:20), as some scholars have suggested,[1] but on the idea that all will be conformed in likeness to him.[2]

Paul's view that Jesus is the firstborn, in the sense that he occupies the leading position in the hierarchy of the new age, has been adopted and worked out in Col. 1:15. There the idea is expressed that Jesus was already the firstborn (πρωτότοκος) when he came to earth. The author of the epistle to the Colossians calls Jesus 'the firstborn of all creation' (πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως) and the 'image' (εἰκών) of God, 'for in him all things in heaven and on earth were created' (Col. 1:15-16).[3] Thus, Paul's idea that Jesus will be the first one in the coming aeon is expanded retrogressively so that Jesus is viewed as being the first one already before the world was created.[4]

In addition to calling Jesus the firstborn of all creation, the author of Colossians also describes him as being the 'firstborn from the dead' (πρωτότοκος ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, 1:18). According to the author, Jesus was the firstborn from the dead 'so that he might come to have the first place in everything' (Col. 1:18). Here the author appears to be dependent on 1 Cor. 15:20, where Paul contends that Jesus has been raised as the first-fruits of those who have fallen asleep. However, the context in which the author of Colossians places this idea is entirely different. He combines it with the idea that Jesus is the first in the hierarchical order, the one in whom everything is created. He calls Jesus 'the firstborn of the dead' in order to give expression to his conviction that Jesus is the one and only Lord over the earth.

In Rev. 1:5 the designation of Jesus as 'the firstborn of the dead' (πρωτότοκος τῶν νεκρῶν) has the same function as in Col. 1:18.[5] The

---

only be established in full in the age to come, on the other hand, accords with Paul's ideas on Jesus' kingship in 1 Cor. 15:24-28. Jesus is already the king and ruler, but he will not exercise this kingship fully until the end of time. Only then will he have defeated all enemies so that everything will be subjected to him; see chapter III, pp. 60-62.

[1] O. Kuss, *Der Römerbrief* (Regensburg: F. Pustet, 1978), pp. 646-647; W. Schmithals, *Der Römerbrief. Ein Kommentar* (Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1988), p. 301.

[2] This conformation will come about either through, or without, a resurrection (1 Cor. 15:51-52; Phil. 3:21; Rom. 8:17; and 2 Cor. 3:18); see chapter XI, pp. 168-169.

[3] The way Colossians uses the words πρωτότοκος and εἰκών resembles Philo's use of these words (see above, p. 134, note 4) more than the way Paul uses them in Rom. 8:29.

[4] See also Heb. 1:6 where the same idea comes to expression.

[5] Cf. Rev. 3:14, where Jesus is called the beginning (ἀρχή) of God's creation, the same thought as expressed in Col. 1:15.

idea conveyed in 1 Cor. 15:20, namely, that Jesus has been raised as the first one with the result that others will be raised as well, is absent in both Col. 1:18 and Rev. 1:5. The designation of Jesus as the firstborn from the dead is just another way of stating that Jesus is Lord over all, dead and living. He is the one through whom God saves the earth.

(3) It is most likely that Paul's view of Jesus as the first-fruits of those who have fallen asleep (1 Cor. 15:20) is also echoed in the designation of Jesus as the first one raised in Acts 26:23. In this passage the designation of Jesus as 'the first to rise from the dead' (πρῶτος ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν) has hardly any function. Although it is part of Paul's defence before Festus and Agrippa against objections leveled at his message of Jesus' resurrection (25:19; 26:8), it does not play a role of any significance. It is merely a stock predicate of Jesus. Any connection with the rest of the sentence ('to proclaim light both to our people as to the Gentiles') is missing.[1] Acts 26:23 does not convey the idea that Jesus' resurrection entails the resurrection of others (1 Cor. 15:20), nor does it promote the idea that the risen Jesus has received the highest conceivable status (Col. 1:18; Rev. 1:5). The designation of Jesus as 'the first to rise from the dead' is nothing more than a reminiscence of Pauline terminology, taken over by the author of Acts as an already traditional way of speaking about the risen Christ.

(4) In Matt. 27:52 the author of the gospel mentions a resurrection of holy ones at the moment of Jesus' death. At that moment 'the earth shook, ... the tombs also were opened, and many bodies of the saints who had fallen asleep were raised.' Matthew's account of the resurrection of the holy ones should be considered unrelated to Paul's idea that Jesus' resurrection is the beginning of the eschatological resurrection. First of all, the resurrection of the holy ones is brought forward as the last in a series of four apocalyptic miracles that accompanied Jesus' death.[2] The mention of signs and miracles accompanying deaths of important persons is traditional.[3] The Matthean account of these phenom-

---

[1] The author of Acts repeatedly uses 'light' as an image for salvation. See, for instance, 26:18; 13:47; Luke 2:32. There is no specific relation between the light of salvation and Jesus' resurrection.

[2] The other signs are the eclipse of the sun (v. 45), the rending of the temple curtain (v. 51), and the earthquake (v. 51).

[3] See E. Klostermann, *Matthäusevangelium*, p. 225; R. Kratz, *Auferweckung als Befreiung. Eine Studie zur Passions- und Auferstehungstheologie des Matthäus, besonders Mt 27,62-28,15* (SBS 65; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1973), pp. 38-45; K. Berger, C. Colpe, *Textbuch*, p. 88.

ena is meant to lead the reader to the same confession as the centurion pronounced; namely, that Jesus truly is God's son (v. 54). Secondly, it should be noticed that the resurrection of the holy ones in Matthew does not take place at the time of Jesus' resurrection, but at the time of his death. Obviously, Matthew's narrative has no connection with Paul's view that Jesus' resurrection will end in that of all righteous ones.

After mentioning that the saints were raised, Matthew adds that they did not go out of their graves and appear in the city until Jesus had been raised. The addition 'after his resurrection' (μετὰ τὴν ἔγερσιν αὐτοῦ) is best explained as an attempt to prevent Jesus' appearances from being preceded by the appearances of other persons. This literary procedure does not need to be explained by assuming influence from Paul (1 Cor. 15:20).[1] It can be accounted for satisfactorily as a sign of the author's deference to Jesus. The author simply wished Jesus' appearance to take place before those of other people.

In brief, Matthew's claim that when Jesus died many bodies of saints were raised and appeared after Jesus' resurrection is unrelated to Paul's idea that Jesus' resurrection formed the beginning of the eschatological resurrection.

(5) The notion that Jesus' resurrection inaugurated the eschatological resurrection is probably of Pauline origin. Paul had very good reasons to develop this idea, for with it he could adequately answer the theological problems he addresses in his first epistle to the Corinthians. In chapter 15 of this epistle, Paul tries to convince the Corinthians that there will be a resurrection at the end of time. To this end he uses the belief in Jesus' resurrection as an argument, a belief shared by the Corinthians. Using a quasi-logical argumentation Paul associates Jesus' resurrection with the eschatological resurrection (vv. 12-19). He then presents the relationship between Jesus' resurrection and that of his followers as the beginning and the continuation of one protracted event. With this idea Paul tries to force the Corinthians to draw the conclusion that, if they believe that Jesus' resurrection has taken place, they must also believe the eschatological resurrection will necessarily

---

[1] As it is, for instance, by D.C. Allison, *End of Ages*, pp. 45-46; cf. I. Maisch, 'Die osterliche Dimension des Todes Jesu. Zur Osterverkündigung in Mt 27,51-54', in: L. Oberlinner (ed.), *Auferstehung Jesu - Auferstehung der Christen. Deutungen des Osterglaubens* (QD 105; Freiburg/Basel/Wien: Herder, 1986), pp. 96-123, esp. 115; G. Greshake, J. Kremer, *Resurrectio Mortuorum. Zum theologischen Verständnis der leiblichen Auferstehung* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1986), pp. 25-26.

follow. Since the idea that Jesus' resurrection is the beginning of the eschatological resurrection was so expedient for Paul's intentions, there is sufficient reason to assume that he formed the idea himself.

(6) The examination of the various passages in early Christian literature in which it is said that Jesus was raised as the first one of all those who are raised has brought to light that it is most likely that this interpretation of Jesus' resurrection was devised by Paul himself. The idea that Jesus was raised as the first one, such as it is expressed in Col. 1:18, Rev. 1:5, and Acts 26:23, can be considered to be dependent on Paul, even though the contexts of those passages differ from that of 1 Cor. 15:20. There is no reason to assume that Matt. 27:52-53 is connected with 1 Cor. 15:20; the passage in Matthew is concerned with something different. In 1 Corinthians 15 Paul had good rhetorical reasons to present Jesus' resurrection as the commencement of the resurrection of all Christians. It is most likely, therefore, that the idea that Jesus' resurrection was the beginning of the eschatological resurrection, as it is conveyed in 1 Cor. 15:20, is Paul's own invention.

IX. THE BELIEF IN JESUS' RESURRECTION

The belief in Jesus' resurrection belongs to the oldest persuasions of Christianity. It is also a belief which has undergone considerable changes in the course of time, especially in the first decades of Christianity. In this chapter the content of the belief in Jesus' resurrection in the earliest period of the Church, that is, in the time of Paul and earlier, will be examined. First, in section a, the earliest traceable phraseology and ideas concerning the belief in Jesus' resurrection will be examined. Then, in section b, the origin of this belief will be investigated. It will be argued that the belief in Jesus' resurrection originated from the Hellenistic-Jewish tradition concerning the heavenly vindication of the martyr. Many Jews believed that those who had been killed innocently for the sake of God's laws were vindicated by God through an exaltation into heaven. Accordingly, Jesus' followers believed that God had raised Jesus into heaven directly after his death to vindicate him over against those who had killed him.[1]

a. *The earliest traceable phraseology and ideas concerning the belief in Jesus' resurrection*

(1) Certain expressions concerning the belief in Jesus' resurrection belong to the oldest layers of Christian tradition; namely, the pre-Pauline tradition transmitted in the letters of Paul. The method of identifying pre-Pauline tradition within Paul's letters has been set out more than once.[2] One of the criteria used to designate certain ideas or expressions as pre-Pauline is the formulaic character of the language in which these ideas are expressed. Certain beliefs were phrased in fixed, although not completely uniform, ways of expression.[3] These fixed ex-

---

[1] The theory on the origin of the belief in Jesus' resurrection advocated in this chapter follows the position set out by H.J. de Jonge in his article 'De opstanding van Jezus. De joodse traditie achter een christelijke belijdenis', in: T. Baarda, H.J. de Jonge, M.J.J. Menken (eds.), *Jodendom en vroeg Christendom: Continuïteit en discontinuïteit* (Kampen: Kok, 1991), pp. 47-61; cf. the section on the history of research, pp. 14-15.

[2] See, for instance, E. Stauffer, *Die Theologie des Neuen Testaments* (Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, ^{4}1948), p. 312; P. Vielhauer, *Geschichte der urchristlichen Literatur. Einleitung in das Neue Testament, die Apokryphen und die Apostolischen Väter* (Berlin/New York: W. de Gruyter, 1975), pp. 9-12 and the literature listed there.

[3] P. Vielhauer, *Geschichte*, p. 14.

pressions are sometimes called credal formulas. The wider the spread of these formulas in independent early Christian writings, the older the beliefs which these formulas convey.[1] Some of these formulas concern the belief in Jesus' resurrection. They are the following.[2]

The most simple formula in which the belief in Jesus' resurrection is expressed is the resurrection formula: God has raised Jesus from the dead (ὁ θεὸς Ἰησοῦν/αὐτὸν ἤγειρεν ἐκ νεκρῶν). The formula occurs nine times in Paul[3] and several times in other writings incorporated in the New Testament.[4] The subject of the formula is God, who is either explicitly mentioned or referred to with a personal pronoun. The object is Jesus, who is sometimes called 'Lord', 'his Son', or 'Christ'; sometimes he is referred to with a personal pronoun. The verb used for 'to raise' is the aorist ἐγεῖραι, but the author of Acts alternates it with ἀναστῆσαι. Characteristic of the formula is the phrase ἐκ (τῶν) νεκρῶν, which is found six times in Paul and eight times in the rest of the New Testament. The resurrection formula is also found in the passive voice with Jesus as subject: Jesus has risen from the dead (Ἰησοῦς ἠγέρθη [or ἀνέστη] ἐκ νεκρῶν).[5] Both the verbs ἐγερθῆναι[6] and ἀναστῆναι are used; and in all instances the phrase ἐκ (τῶν) νεκρῶν occurs.

Another formula in which the belief in Jesus' resurrection is expressed is the death and resurrection formula: Jesus has died and risen (Ἰησοῦς ἀπέθανεν καὶ ἠγέρθη). The formula is found six times in the

---

[1] See, for instance, W. Kramer, *Christos Kyrios Gottessohn. Untersuchungen zu Gebrauch und Bedeutung der christologischen Bezeichnungen bei Paulus und den vorpaulinischen Gemeinden* (AThANT 44; Zürich/Stuttgart: Zwingli, 1963); K. Wengst, *Christologische Formeln und Lieder des Urchristentums* (ZNT 7; Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1972).

[2] The enumeration given here is not intended to be exhaustive.

[3] 1 Thess. 1:10; Gal. 1:1; 1 Cor. 6:14; 15:15; 2 Cor. 4:14; Rom. 4:24; 8:11 (twice); 10:9; see K. Wengst, *Formeln*, pp. 27-33.

[4] Col. 2:12; Eph. 1:20; 1 Pet. 1:21; Acts 2:24, 32; 3:15, 26; 4:10; 5:30; 10:40; 13:30, 33, 34, 37; 17:31; cf. Heb. 11:19.

[5] In Paul's letters: 1 Cor. 15:12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 20; Rom. 6:4, 9; 7:4; in the rest of the New Testament: Matt. 27:64; 28:7; Mark 9:9 (par. Matt. 17:9); Luke 24:46; Acts 10:41; 17:3; John 2:22; 20:9; 21:14; 2 Tim. 2:8; see also Barn. 15:9; Justin, *Apol.* 67:7; *Dial.* 36:5; 53:5; 85:1; 97:1.

[6] The passive ἐγερθῆναι is often used with an intransitive meaning; BDR 78[5]; J. Kremer, 'ἐγείρω', *EWNT*, vol. I (1980), pp. 899-910; J.H. Moulton et alii, *Grammar*, vol. I, p. 163; G. Greshake, J. Kremer, *Resurrectio*, pp. 8-9; E. Fascher, 'Anastasis', pp. 196-98. Cf. Matt. 12:41-42/Luke 11:31-32 where ἐγερθῆναι and ἀναστῆναι are used alternately.

letters of Paul[1] and four times in the rest of the New Testament, sometimes in rather varied form.[2] Characteristic of this formula is the combination of death and resurrection: Jesus' (shameful) death, on the one hand, and his ensuing vindication, on the other hand. Since both elements of the formula, Jesus' death and his resurrection, are also found separately in formulaic expressions, the death and resurrection formula may be considered to be a combination of the dying formula (Jesus has died for ...)[3] with the resurrection formula (Jesus has risen ...), although it cannot be ascertained whether the simple or the composite formula is the earlier.[4] The verb used for 'to rise' is either ἐγερθῆναι or ἀναστῆναι. The phrase ἐκ (τῶν) νεκρῶν does not figure in this formula.

A third more or less fixed way of speaking about Jesus' resurrection is the so-called contrast scheme: Jews have killed Jesus, but God has raised him. Most instances of this scheme occur in the speeches in Acts,[5] but it is also found in the predictions of the passion in Mark 8:31, 9:31, and 10:34 (par.), and is underlying Mark 12:10-11 where it is combined with the tradition of *das gewaltsame Geschick der Propheten* (12:1-9).[6] In this scheme Jesus' enemies, who have killed Jesus, are opposed to God who, in return, has vindicated him by raising

---

[1] 1 Thess. 4:14; 1 Cor. 15:3-5; 2 Cor. 5:15; Rom. 4:25; 8:34; 14:9; cf. 2 Cor. 13:4; K. Wengst, *Formeln*, pp. 92-104.

[2] Heb. 12:2; 1 Pet. 3:18; Rev. 1:18; 2:8; cf. Polycarp, *Phil.* IX, 2; Ignatius, *Smyr.* II; *Rom.* VI, 2.

[3] The dying formula is found, in varying forms, in: 1 Thess. 5:10; 1 Cor. 1:13; 8:11; 2 Cor. 5:14, 15 (twice), 21; Gal. 2:21; 3:13; Rom. 5:6, 8; 14:9, 15; 1 Pet. 2:21; Heb. 2:9; John 11:50, 51; 18:14; cf. Rom. 5:7; 9:3; Phil. 1:29; see K. Wengst, *Formeln*, pp. 78-86; M. de Jonge, 'Jesus' Death for Others and the Death of the Maccabean Martyrs', in: T. Baarda, A. Hilhorst, G.P. Luttikhuizen, A.S. van der Woude (eds.), *Text and Testimony. Essays on New Testament and Apocryphal Literature* (FS A.F.J. Klijn; Kampen: Kok, 1988), pp. 142-151; H.J. de Jonge, 'The Original Setting of the ΧΡΙΣΤΟΣ ΑΠΕΘΑΝΕΝ ΥΠΕΡ Formula', in: R.F. Collins (ed.), *The Thessalonian Correspondence* (BEThL 87; Leuven: University Press/Peeters, 1990), pp. 229-235.

[4] P. Vielhauer, *Geschichte*, p. 14; K. Wengst, *Formeln*, pp. 97, 101. The first part of the formula, concerning Jesus' death, also occurs in the form of a surrender formula: Jesus was delivered for ... (see, for instance Rom. 4:25). The surrender formula itself is found in varying forms in: Gal. 1:4; 2:20; Rom. 4:25; 8:32; Eph. 5:2, 25; Mark 10:45; 16:14 Freer logion; Matt. 20:28; 1 Tim. 2:6; Titus 2:14; see K. Wengst, *Formeln*, pp. 55-77.

[5] Acts 2:22-24, 36; 3:13, 14-15; 4:10; 5:30; 10:39-40; 13:28-30.

[6] See O.H. Steck, *Israel und das gewaltsame Geschick der Propheten. Untersuchungen zur Überlieferung des deuteronomistischen Geschichtsbilds im Alten Testament, Spätjudentum und Christentum* (WMANT 23; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1967), pp. 269-274. The use of this tradition for interpreting Jesus' death is very old; it is already found in 1 Thess. 2:15.

him from the dead. Thus, just as in the death and resurrection formula, Jesus' death and resurrection are contrasted, but the emphasis is not on Jesus as the object but on the two subjects: Jesus' enemies, on the one hand, and God, on the other. The latter part of the scheme, the part about Jesus' resurrection, agrees, of course, with the resurrection formula with Jesus as object. The verb used for 'to raise' is mostly ἐγεῖραι but sometimes ἀναστῆσαι is employed; the phrase ἐκ (τῶν) νεκρῶν is only rarely present.

The dying formula, the death and resurrection formula, and the contrast scheme occur so often in mutually independent passages that they have to be taken as deriving from very early, common tradition; that is, tradition which goes back far behind the secondary coalescence of traditions in 1 Corinthians 15. These turns of phrase must be considered to preserve the earliest traceable concept of Jesus' resurrection, a concept current in the thirties and forties of the first century. In order to trace the origin of this concept, it is essential to notice here its characteristic features.

(2) Three characteristics of the earliest concept of Jesus' resurrection come to the fore in the formulas mentioned. Firstly, the verb for 'to raise' is usually ἐγεῖραι and sometimes ἀναστῆσαι; for 'to rise' the verb ἐγερθῆναι is most often employed, although sometimes ἀναστῆναι is used. Only rarely are alternative verbs, such as ζῆν[1] or ζῳοποιηθῆναι,[2] utilized. Jesus' resurrection is described as a rising, a being raised. Secondly, Jesus' resurrection is perceived as a resurrection from the dead (ἐκ [τῶν] νεκρῶν). The phrase ἐκ (τῶν) νεκρῶν (literally, 'from amongst the dead') indicates that Jesus has been taken away from the realm of the dead; that is, Jesus cannot be counted as one of the dead anymore. Other dead do not, or not yet, share is Jesus' fate, the resurrection to a new life. Those who will be raised at all, will have to await the end of time. Thirdly, Jesus' resurrection is an act of God in reaction to Jesus' death; it is a vindication. These three features characterize the concept of the belief in Jesus' resurrection held by the earliest Christians, including Paul.

Two further characteristics do not find expression in the phraseology, but are nonetheless essential for the early concept of Jesus' resurrection. First of all, Jesus' resurrection was understood to be a resurrection into heaven where Jesus received a new, immortal body. Paul

---

[1] Rom. 14:9; 2 Cor. 13:4; Rev. 1:18; 2:8.
[2] 1 Pet. 3:18.

never speaks about Jesus' resurrection as a restoration of Jesus' life on earth as it was before his death. Paul does not infer that Jesus had been raised from the tomb and that he left his tomb and lived again as he did before his death. Neither does Paul refer in any way to Jesus' ascension into heaven after his resurrection. Paul does speak, however, about appearances of Jesus (1 Cor. 15:5-7) and, although the accounts of these appearances can be interpreted in various ways,[1] it is at least clear that these appearances are conceived by Paul as appearances from heaven.[2] Furthermore, in 1 Thess. 1:10 Paul links Jesus' residence in heaven to his previous resurrection: Jesus is a heavenly being through his resurrection. Finally, in his discussion of the character of the resurrection body of those who will be raised in the future, Paul speaks about Jesus as the 'heavenly one' (ἐπουράνιος; 1 Cor. 15:49), explaining that those being raised in the future will bear the image of the heavenly one. This, too, shows that Jesus was believed to have been raised into heaven. The heavenly life received by Jesus is a glorious and immortal one (1 Cor. 15:35-49).[3] In short, Jesus' resurrection was viewed as a resurrection into heaven, where he had received a new and glorious body.

A second feature of the earliest belief in Jesus' resurrection which is not directly expressed in the formulas mentioned but which is nevertheless essential in the earliest concept of Jesus' resurrection, is the idea that Jesus had been raised soon after his death. Jesus' resurrection is a vindication, an act of God in reaction to his innocent death. As such, Jesus' resurrection was believed to have taken place soon after his death. In the death and resurrection formula as found in 1 Cor. 15:3-5, it is said that Jesus had been raised 'on the third day'. The idea that this 'soon' was 'on the third day' after Jesus' death, is probably due to influence from the traditional idea that God responds to injustice suffered by the just one on the third day or after the third day, reckoned from

---

[1] For a survey of the possible interpretations of the accounts of Jesus' appearances as found in 1 Cor. 15:5-7, see H.J. de Jonge, *Visionaire ervaring en de historische oorsprong van het Christendom* (inaugural address; Leiden: Leiden University, 1992), pp. 10-13.

[2] Paul regards Jesus' appearance to him as a meeting between him and a heavenly person (1 Cor. 9:1). Since Paul does not make any distinction between the nature of Jesus' appearance to him and that of the appearances to Peter, the twelve, and the others, he obviously understood all the appearances of Jesus as appearances from heaven. See J. Weiss, *Urchristentum*, pp. 18-19; U. Wilckens, 'Ursprung', pp. 81-86.

[3] See also Paul's remarks on the idea that Christians will be transformed to the glorious body (image) of Christ in Phil. 3:21; Rom. 8:29; 2 Cor. 3:18.

the climax of his suffering.[1] In the tradition about Jesus' resurrection, the notion of the 'third day' is a secondary element. In tradition independent of Paul, the idea is preserved that Christ was taken up into heaven immediately after his death; see Luke 23:43; Heb. 12:2; cf. 5:8-10; 9:11-12, and also Phil. 2:9; John 3:14.

(3) From the early formulaic expressions concerning Jesus' resurrection as well as from several other indications as were mentioned above, the earliest traceable concept of Jesus' resurrection is that, soon after Jesus' innocent and shameful death and in reaction to it, God vindicated Jesus by lifting him out of the realm of death and into his heavenly realm; there Jesus received a new and immortal body.

b. *The origin of the belief in Jesus' resurrection*

(1) Already from the concept of the belief of Jesus' resurrection held by the earliest Christians it can be concluded that the belief in Jesus' resurrection did not stem from the tradition of the expectation of the eschatological resurrection. The differences between the concept of the resurrection attributed to Jesus and the concept of the resurrection which was believed to take place at the end of time are substantial.

First of all, Jesus had been raised as an individual, whereas the eschatological resurrection was viewed as something in which a group of people would share, namely, all the righteous ones.[2] Secondly, it was believed that Jesus had been raised soon after his death, but the eschatological resurrection would take place at the end of time. Thirdly, Jesus' resurrection was regarded as a resurrection into heaven, whereas the eschatological resurrection was believed to take place on earth. 1 Thess. 4:16-17 describes how, at the end of time, all Christians who have died will be raised (from their graves) on earth and then, once joined by the living, they will be 'caught up' to meet the Lord in the

[1] See H.K. McArthur, '"On the third day". 1 Cor. 15:4b and Rabbinic Interpretation of Hosea 6:2', *NTS* 18 (1971/72), pp. 81-86. There is no direct relationship, as is sometimes suggested, between the expression 'on the third day' as found in 1 Cor. 15:4 and Hos. 6:2 or Jonah 2:1. These last two passages may be seen as reflecting the same idea; namely, that God comes into action on behalf of righteous ones after three days of suffering.

[2] Or, perhaps, all righteous and unrighteous ones since it is possible that Paul held that unrighteous ones would be raised as well; see chapter V, p. 79.

air.[1] Subsequently, all Christians will be united with Christ. Although the eternal bliss is described as a being 'with the Lord in the air,' the resurrection is clearly conceived as something taking place on earth.

The differences between the two concepts of resurrection come especially to the fore when these two resurrections are telescoped together as is done in the idea that Jesus' resurrection is the beginning of the eschatological resurrection (1 Cor. 15:20). The fact, for instance, that there is a distance of at least twenty years between Jesus' resurrection and the eschatological resurrection becomes rather disturbing when the one, Jesus' resurrection, is presented as the beginning of the other, the resurrection at the end of time. An event of the past is seen as the beginning of a future event. The idea that Jesus' resurrection is the beginning of the eschatological resurrection also becomes a forced construction by the fact that the two resurrections are supposed to take place at entirely different places. Jesus had been raised into heaven, whereas Christians would be raised on earth. These two inconsistencies show that Paul's view of Jesus' resurrection as the beginning of the eschatological resurrection is a forced fabric. It tries to harmonize two essentially different concepts of resurrection.

(2) Since the character of Jesus' resurrection differs considerably from that of the eschatological resurrection, the origin of the belief in Jesus' resurrection cannot be traced back to the tradition of the eschatological resurrection. The idea of Jesus' resurrection must be regarded as rooted in a different tradition of resurrection, a tradition speaking about resurrections of individuals, raised soon after their deaths and into heaven, where they received a new and glorious body. Others have shown that such a concept of resurrection existed in ancient Judaism, namely, as part of the tradition which can best be called 'the heavenly vindication of the martyr'. Those who gave their life voluntarily for God's laws, especially martyrs, were believed to be rewarded by God immediately after death with a new life in heaven. This idea of the heavenly vindication of the martyr, that is, an elevation into heaven immediately following the death of the martyr, is sometimes expressed in terms of a resurrection, for example, in the second book of Macca-

[1] The fact that Paul explains in 1 Cor. 15:47-49 that Christians will receive the same resurrection body as Jesus does not mean that, just like Christ, Christians will be raised into heaven. The comparison in 1 Cor. 15:47-49 concerns explicitly the resurrection bodies (see v. 35) and not the resurrections themselves.

bees. It was this martyrological resurrection[1] which the followers of Jesus believed Jesus had experienced.

In 2 Maccabees 7 seven brothers are martyred because they refuse to abide by the orders of the king, Antiochus IV Epiphanes, who wants them to transgress the laws of God by eating pork. The brothers prefer to die for God's laws, hoping that, through their death, God will restore his favour towards Israel (vv. 23, 37-38).[2] They are convinced that, if they give their life for the sake of God's laws, God will give it back to them by restoring them to life. During their tortures one brother after another expresses this belief, driving their torturers to madness. The second brother who is martyred declares: 'You accursed wretch, you dismiss us from this present life, but the King of the universe will raise us up (ἀναστήσει) to an everlasting renewal of life, because we have died for his laws' (v. 9). After he and the third brother have been put to death, the fourth brother expresses the same faith: 'One cannot but choose to die at the hands of mortals and to cherish the hope God gives of being raised (ἀναστήσεσθαι) again by him.' 'But', he says to Antiochus, 'for you there will be no resurrection (ἀνάστασις) to life!' (v. 14).

This martyrological resurrection was supposed to take place soon after the death of the martyr. This can be inferred from the youngest brother's comment on his brothers' willingness to die: 'My brothers have now fallen[3] in loyalty to God's covenant, after a brief pain lead-

---

[1] U. Kellermann has convincingly demonstrated that such a concept of resurrection occurs in 2 Maccabees; U. Kellermann, *Auferstanden in den Himmel. 2 Makkabäer 7 und die Auferstehung der Märtyrer* (SBS 95; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1979). Kellermann's work was preceded by prelimary studies by E. Stauffer, *Theologie*, pp. 164-167, 308-311; T.E. Pollard; 'Martyrdom and Resurrection in the New Testament', *BJRL* 55 (1972-73), pp. 240-251; J.T. Nelis, *II Makkabeeën uit de grondtekst vertaald en uitgelegd* (Bussum: Romen, 1975), pp. 35-37, 168-169; cf. W.H.C. Frend, *Martyrdom and Persecution in the Early Church. A Study of a Conflict from the Maccabees to Donatus* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1965), pp. 44-46; E. Schürer, *History*, vol. II, p. 542.

[2] The idea that a martyr dies innocently for the sake of righteousness in the hope that reconciliation will be established between God and those whom the martyr represents, is perhaps the most characteristic feature of a Jewish martyrdom. For a survey of the characteristics of martyrdoms including references to writings where these can be found, see E. Stauffer, *Theologie*, 308-311; U. Kellermann, 'Das Danielbuch und die Märtyrertheologie der Auferstehung', in: J.W. van Henten (ed.), *Entstehung*, pp. 71-75; cf. J.W. van Henten, *De joodse martelaren als grondleggers van een nieuwe orde. Een studie uitgaande van 2 en 4 Makkabeeën* (Ph.D. diss., Leiden, 1986); see also chapter XII, pp. 181-184.

[3] The verb πεπτώκασιν denotes that the martyrs have died; see 12:34. Hort's conjecture πεπώκασιν (have drunk), followed in many translations, is not based on any MS. The conjecture is provoked by the difficulties which the genitive ἀενάου ζωῆς causes; see below.

ing to eternal life' (v. 36).[1] The genitive ἀενάου ζωῆς does not belong to the following διαθήκην θεοῦ but to the preceding πόνον. The result is an opposition between the brevity of the suffering versus the eternity of life to which it leads.[2] The opposition 'brief pain' versus 'eternal life' only makes sense if the eternal life is supposed to be received immediately after the suffering.[3] This indicates that the martyrs who have died already share in the eternal life.[4]

A possible argument against the view that the resurrection of the martyrs in 2 Maccabees is conceived as a resurrection directly after death, is perhaps found in 12:43-44. There the author relates that Judas collects money to make a sin offering in Jerusalem for the soldiers who had died in the battle.[5] This is the author's comment on Judas' action: 'In doing this he acted very well and honorably, taking account of the resurrection. For if he were not expecting that those who had fallen would rise again, it would have been superfluous and foolish to pray for the dead' (12:43-44).[6] This passage has sometimes been taken as evidence that the resurrection in 2 Maccabees is viewed as an event which will happen sometime in the future, since it is made dependent on the offering made by Judas. However, making offerings in view of the resurrection of martyrs does not necessarily indicate that this resurrection cannot take place soon after the death of the martyr. The idea that prayers are conducive to a martyr's resurrection shortly after his death is found in other ancient comments on martyrdoms.[7]

---

[1] Translation taken from the New English Bible (1970).

[2] C.L.W. Grimm, *Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zu den Apokryphen des Alten Testaments* (4. Lieferung; Leipzig, 1857), pp. 128-129; C. Habicht, *2. Makkabäerbuch* (JSHRZ I,3; Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1976), p. 237; J.T. Nelis, *II Makkabeeën*, p. 175.

[3] H.J. de Jonge, 'Opstanding', p. 51.

[4] J.T. Nelis, *II Makkabeeën*, pp. 174-175; U. Kellermann, *Auferstanden*, pp. 78-80; C. Habicht, *2. Makkabäerbuch*, p. 23; cf. J.W. van Henten, *Martelaren*, pp. 117-120.

[5] The sin offering is made because the soldiers who had died had secretly worn talismans under their tunics.

[6] The text of 12:43-44 is not entirely certain; see the commentaries *ad locum*.

[7] Ignatius, *Eph.* XI, 2; Mart. Pol. XIV, 2. For the interpretation of 2 Macc. 12:43-44 advocated above, see H.J. de Jonge, 'Opstanding', pp. 51-52. Cf. J.W. van Henten, 'The Martyrs as Heroes of the Christian People. Some Remarks on the Continuity between Jewish and Christian Martyrology, with Pagan Analogies', in: M. Lamberigts, P. Van Deun (eds.), *Martyrium in Multidisciplinary Perpective* (BEThL 117; Leuven: University Press, Peeters, 1995), pp. 303-322. In general, the belief that atonement could be established vicariously for deceased people is present in Hellenistic times; see E. Rohde, *Psyche. Seelencult und Unsterblichkeitsglaube der Griechen* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], ^{8}1921), II, p. 128. The idea of baptism for the dead as found in 1 Cor. 15:29 is a close analogy to this belief.

The resurrection which is attributed to the martyrs in 2 Maccabees is a resurrection into heaven. That is, the martyrs receive a new body in heaven. This is confirmed by 15:12-16. Here the author reports about an appearance of Onias, another martyr who had died for the sake of God's covenant (4:34). In a dream Judas sees Onias 'praying with outstretched hands' and, subsequently, he sees Jeremiah stretching out 'his right hand', giving Judas a golden sword (15:12, 15). Since Onias and Jeremiah appear in bodily form, the author obviously supposes that the martyrs have received a new body. Furthermore, since, in the view of the author, appearances come from heaven (2:21), it may be inferred that, in the author's opinion, the martyrs live (in their new body) in heaven. This is also evident from the report about the martyrdom of Razis (14:37-46).[1] The author relates that Razis, after having been severely injured, 'tore out his entrails, took them in both hands and hurled them at the crowd, calling upon the Lord of life and spirit to give them back to him again' (14:46).[2] A further argument in favour of the view that the new life received by the martyrs is a life in a new body in heaven is the author's emphasis on the idea that the new life is a new creation by God in comparison with the old creation. The mother of the seven brothers tells the youngest brother that it was God, the 'Creator of the world', who has given 'life and breath' and likewise he will 'give life and breath back to you again' (7:22-23).[3]

The language and the concepts used to express the belief in the heavenly resurrection of the martyr in 2 Maccabees agree with those used by the earliest Christians to express their belief in the resurrection of Jesus. The verb ἀνιστάναι (cf. ὁ τοῦ κόσμου βασιλεὺς ἡμᾶς ἀναστήσει, 2 Macc. 7:9) recurs in the death and resurrection formula in 1 Thess. 4:14 and in the resurrection formulas in Acts.[4] Furthermore, the opposition of death and resurrection in 2 Macc. 7:14 (die ... being raised) recurs in the so-called death and resurrection formula in several passages in Paul and the rest of the New Testament.[5] The so-called

---

[1] T.E. Pollard, 'Martyrdom', pp. 242-243; U. Kellermann, *Auferstanden*, pp. 86-87.

[2] See also 7:11 where it is reported that the third brother stretched forth his hands, saying: 'I got these from Heaven, and because of his laws I disdain them, and from him I hope to get them back again.'

[3] U. Kellermann, *Auferstanden*, pp. 68-71.

[4] Acts 2:24, 32; 3:26; 13:32, 33; 17:31. It must be admitted that, in the formulas occurring in Paul's epistles, the verb ἀνιστάναι is used only once; Paul uses mostly the verb ἐγείρειν.

[5] 1 Thess. 4:14; 1 Cor. 15:3-5; 2 Cor. 5:15; Rom. 4:25; 8:34; 14:9; cf. 2 Cor. 13:4; Heb. 12:2; 1 Pet. 3:18; Rev. 1:18; 2:8.

contrast scheme, which is predominantly found in Acts,[1] is present in 2 Macc. 7:9 : 'You accursed wretch (Σὺ μέν, ἀλάστωρ), you dismiss us from this present life, but the King of the universe (ὁ δὲ τοῦ κόσμου βασιλεύς) will raise us up.'[2] Besides the agreements in language,[3] there is the agreement as to the time and place of the resurrection. The resurrection of the martyrs, as well as that of Jesus, was thought to be a resurrection into heaven. The raised martyrs and Jesus are believed to have received a new, glorious body in heaven soon after their death. The conclusion must be, therefore, that the earliest belief in Jesus' resurrection, as found, for instance, in Paul, arose in accordance with the tradition of the heavenly vindication of the martyr as reflected in 2 Maccabees.

(3) The tradition of the heavenly vindication of the martyr is also found in other ancient Jewish writings, although no other writing agrees with the earliest Christian tradition in terminology as much as 2 Maccabees.[4] Josephus reports on the attempt of some righteous Jews to take down the statue of the eagle which Herod the Great had erected on the temple gate.[5] To encourage the rebellion, the Jewish leaders explained that 'it was a noble deed to die for the law of one's country; for the souls of those who came to such an end attained immortality.'[6] After the Jews have been taken into custody, the king is amazed that they are delighted to know that they will be put to death. They respond by saying: 'After our death, we shall enjoy greater felicity' (653). They speak about life after death in terms of the immortality of the soul, however, and not in terms of resurrection. This is undoubtedly due to Josephus' aim to accommodate his story to popular Hellenistic beliefs.

---

[1] Acts 2:22-24, 36; 3:13, 14-15; 4:10; 5:30; 10:39-40; 13:28-30.

[2] H.J. de Jonge, 'Opstanding', p. 58.

[3] There are also some differences in the language used for the belief in the resurrection of Jesus and that of the martyrs. The use of the phrase ἐκ (τῶν) νεκρῶν is perhaps the most striking one: in Jewish martyrological texts the phrase is missing; in early Christian texts it occurs frequently.

[4] The tradition of the heavenly vindication of the martyr occurs also, of course, in 4 Maccabees, since the martyrdoms of Eleazar and the seven brothers (2 Maccabees 6-7) are taken up in 4 Maccabees 5-18; see especially 4 Macc. 5:37; 7:19; 9:8; 16:25; 17:5, 11-13, 18; 18:23. 4 Maccabees, however, is dependent on 2 Maccabees. Because of the direct relationship between the two writings and the date of 4 Maccabees (probably end first century C.E.), there is no need to examine 4 Maccabees here separately.

[5] Josephus, *Bell. Jud.* I, 648-655.

[6] Josephus, *Bell. Jud.* I, 650; this and all subsequent quotations of Josephus' *Bellum Judaicum* are taken from H.St.J. Thackeray's translation in LCL.

Yet, it is clear that his presentation of the leaders' view conforms to the scheme of the heavenly vindication of the martyr.[1]

The tradition of the heavenly vindication of the martyr which is described in terms of the Hellenistic concept of the immortality of the soul occurs also in Wisdom of Solomon 2-4.[2] In these chapters various ideas on life after death have been combined and placed within an eschatological framework. As a result, the views expressed here have become extremely complex.[3] The author reckons with an eschaton which includes a judgement of both righteous and unrighteous ones (3:7-9; 4:16-5:23), but he also speaks about the special treatment of some righteous ones in the time directly after their deaths and before the eschaton (3:1-6; 4:7-15).

In 3:1-6 the author describes the fate of the righteous ones who, as narrated in chapter 2, have been innocently killed by unrighteous ones. The souls of these righteous are 'in the hand of God,' he assures. 'In the eyes of the foolish they seemed to have died, ..., but they are at peace' (3:1-3). Thus, those who have been shamefully put to death are vindicated by God in that he gives them a new, peaceful life in heaven directly after their deaths.[4]

Another group of righteous ones who, according to Wisdom of Solomon, receive a special, preferential treatment after death are the ones who have died prematurely.[5] Concerning this group the author writes that 'while living among sinners they were taken up (μετετέθη)' (4:10).[6] 'For their souls were pleasing to the Lord, therefore he took

---

[1] Josephus' narrative contains, for example, the theme of absolute loyalty to God's laws, the phrase 'dying for God's laws', and the theme of the joy and repose of the martyrs during their tortures accompanied with the astonishment which this causes among their torturers. These are all typically martyrological themes; see U. Kellermann, *Auferstanden*, p. 104.

[2] U. Kellermann, *Auferstanden*, p. 103.

[3] See C. Larcher, *Études sur le livre de la sagesse* (EtB; Paris: J. Gabalda, 1969), pp. 301-327; J.J. Collins, 'The Root of Immortality: Death in the Context of Jewish Wisdom', *HThR* 71 (1978), pp. 179-192, esp. 187-189.

[4] The description of the post-mortal fate of the righteous ones in 3:1-6 should be distinguished from the fate of other righteous ones at the end of time in 3:7-9. Between verses 6 and 7 the tense of the verbs changes from the aorist (προσεδέξατο) to the future (ἀνα-λάμψουσιν). Furthermore, the phrase ἐν καιρῷ ἐπισκοπῆς (v. 7) refers to God's visitation on the last day (cf. ἐν ἡμέρᾳ διαγνώσεως in 4:18); C. Larcher, *Le livre de la sagesse de Solomon* (EtB 3; Paris: J. Gabalda, 1983-1985), vol. I, pp. 284-285.

[5] From 3:13 to 4:15 the author speaks about various themes concerning offspring, such as the situation of righteous and unrighteous ones who have no offspring, the offspring of adulterers, and the offspring who die at a young age before reaching maturity.

[6] The term μετετέθη stems from the tradition of the rapture of living righteous ones such as Enoch (Gen. 5:24; 1 Enoch 11:15) and Elijah (2 Kgs. 2:11); see G. Haufe, 'Ent-

them quickly (ἔσπευσεν) from the midst of wickedness' (4:14). This means that the righteous ones who die before they reach maturity are considered to be especially rewarded in that they receive the eternal glory immediately after their deaths.[1] But there is no hope for the prematurely deceased offspring of unrighteous ones; neither in the time immediately after death, nor in the time of judgement (3:18).[2]

Thus, in the view of the author of the Wisdom of Solomon, certain righteous ones, namely, those who are put to death as innocent victims by unrighteous ones and those who die before they reach maturity, receive a favourable treatment. They are privileged. God grants them the eternal glory immediately after death. They do not have to wait until the day of judgement like other righteous ones.[3]

Although the description of the death and the renewal of life of special righteous ones in Wisdom 2-4 does not entirely agree with that

---

rückung', pp. 105-113. The main difference between the rapture of Enoch and Elijah and that of the righteous ones who died prematurely is that the latter died before being taken away, whereas the former did not die at all. Although in Wis. 4:10 the author says that they were taken up 'while living among sinners,' this does not mean that they were alive when they were taken up. The ones in view are (still) the ones who have died prematurely. Therefore, 'while *being* among the sinners' would be a better translation; see C. Larcher, *Sagesse*, vol. II, p. 330.

[1] Similar to 3:1-6, the passage 4:7-15 is a description of the fate of a special group of righteous ones, namely, those who have died prematurely, in contrast to the ensuing description of the fate of all other righteous ones in the eschaton in 4:16-5:23. Just as between 3:6 and 3:7, the tense of the verbs changes from the aorist to the future between 4:15 and 4:16.

[2] In 3:18 the author speaks about the time directly after death (v. 18a) as well as about the day of judgement (ἐν ἡμέρᾳ διαγνώσεως, v. 18b; cf. 3:7). There will be no hope for the prematurely deceased unrighteous ones in the time directly after death, nor will there be consolation for them on the day of judgement.

[3] One should not overlook the differences between the post-mortal fate of the special righteous ones (those who die untimely) in 3:1-6, 4:7-15, on the one hand, and the fate of all other righteous ones at the end of time in 3:7-9, 4:16-5:23, on the other. As already set out in the historical survey of earlier research, Ruppert calls the reward which the righteous ones receive according to Wisdom 2-5 'the eschatological resurrection of the righteous one' (see pp. 9-10). Apparently, he does not make a distinction between the special righteous ones of 3:1-6; 4:7-15 and the righteous ones in the eschaton of 3:7-9; 4:16-5:23. True, the mention of the eschatological judgement of all people in 4:16-5:23 presupposes a preceding (eschatological) resurrection of all people (C. Larcher, *Études*, pp. 321-327). The view that the special righteous ones in 3:1-6, those who have been put to death by the unrighteous ones (2:1-20), are rewarded with an eschatological resurrection is therefore understandable. It is nevertheless incorrect. The misunderstanding is also occasioned by the fact that it is said that at the time of judgement, the unrighteous will be confronted with the righteous ones whom they have killed (5:1-7). However, from the appearance of the slain righteous ones at the scene of the judgement, one must not infer that these righteous ones will not be rewarded until the day of judgement. In 3:1-6 it is clearly stated that the righteous ones who were innocently killed are with God immediately after their deaths.

of the fate of the martyrs in 2 Maccabees, the same themes occur in both writings. The righteous ones are tortured by unrighteous ones so that their faith is tested (Wis. 2:19-20; 3:5-6; 2 Macc. 7:33). God is expected to respond by lifting the righteous ones into his presence. The contrast of 'insignificant suffering' versus 'great glory' occurs both in 2 Macc. 7:36 (see above) and in Wis. 3:5: 'Having been disciplined a little (ὀλίγα), they will receive great good (μεγάλα).' Although Wisdom does not describe life after death in terms of resurrection as 2 Maccabees 7 does, the idea in the two writings is the same: those righteous ones who die innocently for the sake of God's righteousness will be rewarded by God with a new life in his presence directly after their deaths.

In Bib. Ant. 32:2-3 and 40:4 the deaths of Isaac and the daughter of Jephthah are described in terms similar to those which 2 Maccabees uses for the death and heavenly vindication of the martyr. In 32:2-3 Abraham says to Isaac: 'Behold now, my son, I am offering you as a holocaust and am delivering you into the hands that gave you to me' (32:2).[1] Isaac fully accepts his fate, knowing that, when sacrificed, he will 'inherit life without limit.' He knows that his loyalty to God and his father will serve as instruction for future generations. Thus, the author expresses the belief that, in contradistinction to other righteous ones, Isaac will receive eternal life immediately after his death because he dies in obedience to God's laws.[2] The death of Jephthah's daughter (Bib. Ant. 39-40) is depicted as conforming to the sacrifice of Isaac.[3] The daughter of Jephthah, Seila, accepts voluntarily her destiny of being sacrificed because of her father's oath. Seeing the girl's wisdom, which contrasts sharply with the foolishness of her father, God responds by saying: 'Her death will be precious before me always, and she will go away and fall into the bosom of her mothers' (40:4). The phrase 'she will fall into the bosom of her mothers' (*decidet in sinum matrum suarum*) does not refer to a burial along with her ancestors, as is mentioned with regard to many other righteous ones who die.[4] Rather, it refers to a transfer to a place of glory for special righteous

---

[1] This and all subsequent quotations from the Biblical Antiquities are taken from the translation by D.J. Harrington in: *OTP*, vol. II, pp. 297-377.

[2] C. Perrot, P. Bogaert, *Les Antiquités Bibliques* (SC 230; Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1976), vol. II, p. 170.

[3] C. Perrot, P. Bogaert, *Antiquités*, vol. II, p. 190.

[4] Bib. Ant. 28:10; 29:4. The author's view on the post-mortal fate of the 'ordinary' righteous ones is that their souls are stored away with those of their ancestors. The souls have to await the end of time when they will be restored to life and be judged (19:12; 3:10; 23:13; 32:13).

ones.[1] Seila is rewarded in a special way in that she is taken up to the realm of God just like Isaac and all the others who gave their lives voluntarily for God's sake.[2] Thus, although Isaac and Seila are not presented as martyrs who were killed at the hands of their enemies, they are depicted as righteous ones who surrendered their lives voluntarily in obedience to God. The reward was the same: Seila inherited the eternal glory immediately after her death.

The tradition of the heavenly vindication of the martyr is also reflected in the Testament of Job. Job's children die as a result of the fact that their house collapses upon them (18:1). Subsequently, Job's wife begs for permission to allow soldiers to dig through the ruins so that she may find and bury her children (39:8-10). Job prevents this from happening by saying that the children will not be found 'since they were taken up into heaven by the Creator their King' (39:12).[3] Because his wife cannot believe him, Job, after praying to God, says to her: 'Look up with your eyes to the east and see my children crowned with the splendor of the heavenly one' (40:3). In contrast to other righteous ones, Job's children are rewarded in a special way in that they are moved into the presence of God in heaven immediately after their deaths. Apparently, the children have been taken up with body and soul.[4] They do not receive a new body as the martyrs in 2 Maccabees. Although expressed again in different terms, the idea is that righteous ones who die innocently for the sake of righteousness are rewarded by being taken up into the presence of God directly after their deaths.

The tradition of the heavenly vindication of the martyr which originated in Judaism was shared by Christian Jews and taken over by other Christians. Jesus' followers interpreted his death in terms of this tradi-

---

[1] The *sinus* (κόλπος) is that of people reclining at a table (John 13:23); in this case, at the feast table in the hereafter; R. Meyer, 'κόλπος', *ThWNT*, vol. III (1938), pp. 824-826. The idea that the patriarchs are already present there is traditional (Luke 16:22; Matt. 8:11/Luke 13:28; cf. 4 Macc. 13:16); see K. Berger, *Auferstehung*, p. 112, note 503. The reason why it is called the bosom 'of her mothers' is probably due to the fact that 'falling into the bosom of her fathers.' when used in reference to a girl, would have an undesirable sexual connotation.

[2] In the case of Isaac it remains, of course, unclear whether or not he was really taken up to heaven because of his willingness to die, since he was not actually sacrificed. The author is certainly of the opinion, however, that if Isaac had been sacrificed, he would have been transferred to heaven.

[3] This and all subsequent translations of the Testament of Job are taken from the translation by R.P. Spittler in: *OTP*, vol I, pp. 829-868.

[4] The idea that Job's children are taken up with body and soul must be due to influence from the tradition of the rapture of living righteous ones like Enoch and Elijah (see above, p. 150, note 6). The difference between the rapture of Job's children and that of Enoch and Elijah is that the latter are taken up before dying, the former after dying.

tion of the heavenly vindication of the martyr. Similarly, Christians considered their fellow-Christians who died for the sake of Christianity to be martyrs. Consequently, they believed that these martyrs were raised immediately after death into heaven.[1] Paul, at a difficult point in his life, even saw himself as a possible prospective martyr for Christ's sake. In his letter to the Philippians, which was written during his imprisonment in Ephesus, he reflects on his fate and on the possibility that his life may end soon.[2] 'My desire is to depart and be with Christ, for that is far better,' he confesses to the Philippians (1:23). In other words, Paul believes he will be with Christ in heaven immediately after his death. In 3:10-11 he expresses the same belief, this time in terms of a resurrection in comparison with Jesus' resurrection: 'I want to know Christ and the power of his resurrection and the sharing of his sufferings by becoming like him in his death, if somehow I may attain the resurrection from the dead.' Thus, in Phil. 1:23 and 3:10-11, Paul does not regard his own resurrection to be part of the eschatological resurrection, but he reflects on his death and resurrection in terms of the tradition of the heavenly vindication of the martyr. The following indications support this view. First, the far-reaching correspondence in language which he uses for Jesus' resurrection and for his own (3:10-11), especially his use of the phrase ἐκ νεκρῶν. This phrase means 'from amongst the dead.' Paul normally uses this phrase in connection with Jesus' (martyrological) resurrection.[3] Second, Paul's idea that after his death he will be 'with Christ' (1:23). Third, his use of martyrological themes throughout this letter whenever he reflects on his situa-

---

[1] For examples, see: Mart. Pol. IX, 2; XIV, 2; Ignatius, *Smyr.* II; *Rom.* IV, 2-3; *Eph.* XI, 1-2; *Pol.* VII, 1; *Magn.* IX, 1-2; 2 Clem. XIX, 3-4; Mart. Pionii XXI, 4; Mart. Andreae I, 10; Mart. Pauli IV; see W.H.C. Frend, *Martyrdom, passim.*

[2] In his commentary on Philippians, E. Lohmeyer, without indicating any traditio-historical background, already argued in favour of the view that Paul, in his letter to the Philippians, saw himself as a martyr ; E. Lohmeyer, *Philipper, passim*, esp. pp. 63-64, 139-142. See also E. Stauffer, *Theologie*, p. 165; T.E. Pollard, 'Martyrdom', pp. 145-246; U. Kellermann, *Auferstanden*, 109-113; cf. L. G. Bloomquist, *The Function of Suffering in Philippians* (JSNT.S 78; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993).

[3] U. Kellermann, *Auferstanden*, p. 113; E. Lohmeyer, *Philipper*, p. 141. There are only two passages in which the phrase ἐκ (τῶν) νεκρῶν is not used for Jesus' resurrection, namely, Rom. 6:13 and Rom. 11:15. In these passages 'the dead' (νεκροί) represent the situation of being dead. A suitable translation would be 'from the state of death'; A.J.M. Wedderburn, *Baptism*, pp. 44-45. See also the remarks on Rom. 6:1-11 in chapter XI, pp. 169-171. Note the difference in meaning of 'the dead' in 'he has risen from (amongst) the dead' and 'the resurrection of the dead'. The latter expression denotes the eschatological resurrection; see 1 Cor. 15:12-19. The former refers to Jesus' martyrological resurrection.

tion.[1] Fourth, Paul's acquaintance with this idea of the heavenly vindication. This is clear, of course, from his view on Jesus' resurrection, but possibly also from 1 Thess. 3:13. The saints who, according to Paul, will accompany Jesus at his coming in glory may very well be those righteous ones who were elevated to heaven as a special reward.[2]

(4) The passages discussed above are evidence that a tradition existed in ancient Judaism concerning the heavenly vindication of righteous ones, especially martyrs, who died innocently for God's laws.[3] Although the life they received after death is described in various ways—sometimes in terms of resurrection, sometimes in terms of the immortality of the soul, and sometimes in terms of a rapture—the idea is the same. Righteous ones who die innocently for the sake of God's laws are vindicated by God who gives them a new life in heaven immediately after their deaths. This idea can best be termed the heavenly vindication of the martyr. Although the person vindicated in this way is not in all cases a martyr in the strict sense of the word, it would be confusing to speak about the heavenly vindication of the *righteous one*.[4] Whenever the heavenly vindication of a martyr is described in terms of a resurrection, it is best to speak of a martyrological resurrection as distinguished from the eschatological resurrection.

The origins of the tradition of the heavenly vindication do not need to be traced in the present study. Nor is it necessary to show how it became possible for this idea of vindication to be expressed in terms of resurrection.[5] In the interest of the present study it is, however, all-

---

[1] Kellermann lists, for example, the theme of the battle (3:12-16) and that of the joy while suffering (1:8; 4:4); U. Kellermann, *Auferstanden*, pp. 110-112.

[2] It is not clear, however, whether these saints died before being taken up, like martyrs, or were taken up at the end of their lives right before dying, like, for instance, Elijah. Both are possible, see 4 Ezra 7:28; 13:52; cf. 4 Ezra 6:26; 14:9; 8:51, 62. See also chapter VI, p. 96.

[3] This Jewish tradition is also attested by Tacitus, *Hist.* V 5, 5: *(Iudaei) animos proelio aut suppliciis peremptorum aeternos putant.*

[4] The idea of the heavenly vindication of the martyr occupies its own place within the tradition of the suffering righteous one. Wisdom 2-5 may reflect the stage of the tradition in which this idea emerged separately. The author speaks about the vindication of righteous ones in general terms and about the special, heavenly vindication of special righteous ones. On the relationship between the tradition of the suffering righteous one and the martyrological tradition, see the survey of the discussion on the origins of martyrology in J.W. van Henten (ed.), *Entstehung*, pp. 220-261.

[5] Kellermann argues that the concept of the martyrological resurrection may be a transitional form or development of the tradition of the eschatological resurrection as in Dan. 12:1-3; U. Kellermann, *Auferstanden*, p. 65. This is possible but it is incapable of proof due to lack of evidence. Dan. 12:2 describes the eschatological resurrection of

important that the concept of the martyrological resurrection be distinguished from that of the eschatological resurrection. When Christianity came into being, these were two distinct concepts, representing two different traditions which existed independently. In 2 Maccabees, only the concept of the martyrological resurrection is present. The notion of the eschatological resurrection, as well as any other eschatological theme, is absent. In Biblical Antiquities, however, one encounters both concepts. In Bib. Ant. 3:10, for instance, the author speaks about the resurrection of the righteous ones at the end of time. But Jephthah's daughter and Isaac are exempt from this resurrection, for they are thought to be already with God in heaven. A distinction between the fate of the righteous ones at the end of time and that of special righteous persons directly after death is also made in Josephus, Wisdom of Solomon, and the Testament of Job. The latter persons are vindicated by God in that he gives them a new life in heaven soon after their deaths. This new life may or may not be described in terms of resurrection. The former are expected to receive the eternal glory at the end of time. Their fate, too, may or may not be described in terms of resurrection. In short, special righteous ones, namely, those who voluntarily gave up their lives for God or for God's laws (who are called martyrs here), were believed to be privileged in comparison with other 'ordinary' righteous ones. The latter would receive the eternal glory at the end of time, the former directly after their deaths.

(5) It has been demonstrated in this chapter that a tradition existed in ancient Judaism concerning the heavenly vindication of the martyr. This tradition is the background against which the origin of the belief in Jesus' resurrection should be explained. The belief that God had raised Jesus from the dead arose in accordance with the belief in the heavenly vindication of the martyr. Jesus' followers believed that, like with other martyrs, God had vindicated Jesus soon after his death by lifting him up from the realm of death into his heavenly realm. There Jesus received a new, glorious body. For the traditio-historical analysis of the idea that Jesus' resurrection is the beginning of the eschatological resurrection, the reconstruction of the origin of the belief in Jesus'

---

both the righteous and unrighteous ones. In this context it is said that 'the wise shall shine like the brightness of the sky, and those who lead many to righteousness, like the stars forever and ever' (v. 3). This may mean that, in the author's view, special righteous ones will receive a special reward. But if this is so, this special reward is not seen as something received immediately after death, but at the end of time, just like the reward of 'ordinary' righteous ones.

resurrection as presented in this chapter is of utmost importance. Since the belief in Jesus' resurrection does not stem from the tradition of the eschatological resurrection, the idea that Jesus' resurrection is the beginning of the eschatological resurrection cannot be seen exclusively as a derivative of the belief in Jesus' resurrection.

X. THE ORIGIN OF THE IDEA OF JESUS' RESURRECTION AS THE BEGINNING OF THE ESCHATOLOGICAL RESURRECTION

It was argued in the previous chapter that Paul could not derive the idea that Jesus' resurrection is the beginning of the eschatological resurrection from the belief in Jesus' resurrection. It was also argued that the belief in Jesus' resurrection and the expectation of the eschatological resurrection have two different concepts of resurrection in view and that these stem from two distinct traditions. The question of how these two different concepts of resurrection came to be connected in the idea that Jesus' resurrection is the beginning of the eschatological resurrection is now all the more pressing. How could Paul come to regard Jesus' martyrological resurrection to be the first stage of the eschatological resurrection? The answer to this question is to be found primarily in Paul's view on Christ (section a). Furthermore, Paul's idea is not without parallels. It can be shown that a similar notion existed in contemporary Judaism (section b).

a. *The rise of the idea that Jesus' resurrection is the beginning of the eschatological resurrection*

(1) The rise of Paul's idea that Jesus' resurrection is the beginning of the eschatological resurrection can be explained from his view on Jesus and the apostle's assessment of the time in which he lived as the last stage of history. The conviction that the end of time had started, that is, that the old aeon was almost finished and that the new aeon was about to begin and, in a way, had already begun, is found throughout Paul's letters. 'The ends of ages have come' (τὰ τέλη τῶν αἰώνων κατήντηκεν), says Paul to the Corinthians (1 Cor. 10:11).[1] The remainder of the old aeon, which is characterized by evil (Gal. 1:4),[2] is short (1 Cor. 7:29), for the aeon of glory is coming (Rom. 8:18). In a way the glory of the new age has already come; namely, through the Spirit which is a 'first installment' of the glory to come (2 Cor. 1:22, cf. Rom. 8:23). Therefore, Christians are a new creation, for they already participate

---

[1] See also chapter III, pp. 60-62.

[2] See also 1 Cor. 1:20; 2:6, 8; 3:18; 4:4; 7:26; Rom. 1:18.

partially in the eternal glory.[1] In short, according to Paul, the transition of the old to the new aeon has started and the new aeon will soon be full reality.[2]

In Paul's view the turn of the ages has started with Jesus' mission on earth. 'When the fullness of time had come,' Paul writes to the Galatians, 'God sent his Son, born of a woman, born under the law, in order to redeem those who were under the law, so that we might receive adoption as children' (Gal. 4:4-5). The idea reflected here, as well as in many other passages,[3] is that God has prepared the realization of his salvation carefully, and that he has chosen Jesus to be his instrument in establishing this salvation. For a long time God has planned the salvation of the chosen ones. He would accomplish this plan by sending Jesus, his Son. In this view on history and salvation Jesus is considered to be a pre-existent redeemer, someone who was already appointed by God to be the saviour of his people even before his actual mission.[4] The idea of Jesus' pre-existence is not very important for the present argument. The idea underlying it, however, is very important; namely, that God has sent Jesus to the world at a certain point in history. More precisely, God has brought Jesus into action as the saviour of the world at the end of time (Gal. 4:4).[5] God has started the turn of the aeons by sending Jesus to earth.

Without sufficient justification it is often maintained that, according to Paul, the end of time has started with Jesus' death and resurrection.[6] This presentation of Paul's view on the end of time, however, is incorrect. According to Paul, the end of time has started with Jesus' mission, which consisted of more than his death and resurrection. In other words, the end of time has started with Jesus' life, and not with his death. The view that Paul believed that the end of time has started with Jesus' death and resurrection is the result of two misunderstandings. One of these misunderstandings, which is due to a biased, dogmatic approach to Paul's theology, is the misplaced notion that Paul believed

---

[1] See, for instance, 2 Cor. 5:17. Compare also the idea of the gradual conformation to the image of Jesus which comes to expression in 2 Cor. 3:18.

[2] So far, all the propositions which attempt to see a development in Paul's thinking with regard to the nearness of the end of time, that is, from *Nah-* to *Fernerwartung*, have proven to be unconvincing; A. Lindemann, 'Entwicklung', *passim*.

[3] See, for instance, Rom. 8:3; Phil. 2:6-11.

[4] See M. de Jonge, *Christology*, pp. 42-43.

[5] Cf. Mark 1:15; Heb. 9:26.

[6] See, for instance, D.C. Allison, *End of Ages*, p. 65, who states in one and the same sentence that 'the coming of Jesus Christ marks the inbreaking of God's kingdom' and that 'the new age has dawned with the death of Jesus.'

that the kernel of Jesus' mission was Jesus' death and resurrection. Consequently, it is often assumed that Jesus' death and resurrection mark the beginning of the eschaton. The other misapprehension has its starting point in the remarks of Paul that Jesus' resurrection was his exaltation and enthronement as Lord; that is to say, Jesus' resurrection was his enthronement as eschatological Lord and Christ (messiah).[1] From these remarks it is inferred that the beginning of Jesus' eschatological Lordship marks the beginning of the eschaton. However, the idea that Jesus has become the eschatological Lord and Christ (messiah) can only have arisen if Jesus was already viewed as an eschatological figure before his death. In other words, the claim that Jesus was the messiah after Easter can only be understood if one assumes that such a claim already existed before Easter.[2] Jesus must already have been seen as an eschatological figure before his death. Some of his followers must have believed that the end of time had started with his life on earth.

The conclusion that some of the followers of Jesus must have believed during his lifetime that the end of time had started with Jesus' activity in this world fully corresponds to the view that the Jesus movement was predominantly eschatological in character.[3] As was already argued in chapter V above, the Synoptics present Jesus' message as focused on the imminence of the kingdom of God. The kingdom of God which Jesus announced was not something which was only to be realized in the future. In a way it was also something already present in Jesus' words and actions.[4] Through Jesus' ministry the kingdom of God, the glory of the new aeon, was being realized. Both Paul (Gal. 4:4) and the Synoptic gospels give evidence for the view that followers of Jesus already perceived him during his lifetime as the messiah, the one in whom God's kingdom was breaking through and by whom God was saving Israel and the world. In short, they saw Jesus as the one with whom the end of time had started.

(2) Since Jesus was seen as an eschatological figure, his whole ministry was viewed as being eschatological as well. His preaching and all his activity were thought to belong to the events of the end of time. Simi-

---

[1] See, for instance, Rom. 1:3-4; 10:9; Phil. 2:6-11.

[2] See chapter VI, pp. 116-118 and the literature listed there. Merklein, a little more cautiously, speaks about an explicit Christology after Easter as the continuation of an implicit Christology before Easter; H. Merklein, 'Auferweckung', pp. 12-13.

[3] See chapter V, p. 92.

[4] See, for instance, Mark 1:15; Matt. 11:2-6/Luke 7:18-23; Matt. 13:16/Luke 10:23; Matt. 12:28/Luke 11:20.

larly, even his death was understood as an event with eschatological significance. As Jesus' death was at one moment interpreted as a martyrological death, it was seen as bringing about God's reconciliation for the group of people the martyr represented.[1] However, while the deaths of Jewish martyrs had occasioned God's reconciliation for only a limited group of their contemporaries, the atoning effect of Jesus' death was thought to extend to all who accepted him as God's definitive messenger, without limitation of time, location, or nationality.[2] The atonement effectuated by Jesus' death was believed to have eschatological effect because the one who had established the atonement was the definitive eschatological agent, God's final and therefore unique envoy, the messiah, the one through whom God was establishing his kingdom.

Just like his death, Jesus' resurrection was understood as an eschatological event. Jesus' resurrection, already understood as a martyrological resurrection, came to be seen as an eschatological event because Jesus himself, the one who had risen, was taken as an eschatological figure. Since Jesus' resurrection was felt to belong to the events of the end of time, Paul can also state that Jesus' resurrection is the beginning of the eschatological resurrection. Or, in his own words, that 'Jesus had been raised from the dead as the first-fruits of those who have fallen asleep' (1 Cor. 15:20). Thus, the idea that Jesus' resurrection is the beginning of the eschatological resurrection is not rooted in the concept of the resurrection, but in the assessment of the person raised as an eschatological agent. The one raised was previously God's eschatological envoy, his messiah, the one through whom God was establishing his kingdom. Thus, his resurrection came to be conceived as an eschatological event and, eventually, as the beginning of the eschatological resurrection.

(3) In Paul's view Jesus was the agent of God sent at the end of time to save the world. As a result, not only his ministry, but also his resurrection came to be interpreted as an eschatological event, an event belonging to the end of time. Hence, it was only a small step for Paul to designate Jesus' resurrection as the beginning of the eschatological resurrection.

---

[1] See chapter XIII and the literature listed there.

[2] See M. de Jonge, *Jesus*, pp. 42-46.

b. *Analogies in contemporary Jewish thought*

(1) The interpretation of Jesus' martyrological resurrection as an eschatological event, as discussed in the previous section, was an inner-Christian development. The question has to be asked, however, whether this development can be illustrated by analogies in Jewish literature of the period.

There are certainly no close parallels to Paul's understanding of Jesus' resurrection as an eschatological event. Not once is a martyrological resurrection interpreted as the beginning of the eschatological resurrection.

(2) There is, however, one account of a martyrdom which shows some resemblance to Paul's interpretation of Jesus' martyrological resurrection. This account is found in Assumption of Moses 9-10. After describing the disasters which will come upon Israel in the end of time (As. Mos. 7-8), the author makes Moses foretell the fate of a man, Taxo, and his seven sons, who will choose to die rather than to transgress the commandments of the Lord. In a speech to his sons, Taxo explains that the time of disaster in which they live is a punishment of God for the sins Israel has committed. He calls on them to retire with him in a cave in order to die there. Their deaths will bring a turn in the fate of Israel, for their blood 'will be avenged before the Lord' (9:7).[1] The prediction of the deaths of Taxo and his sons, which are conceived as a martyrdom,[2] ends at this point. Nothing is said about their heavenly vindication.[3] Instead, the author goes directly to an announcement by Moses of the coming of God's visitation, his final judgement. This will apparently take place immediately after Taxo's death: 'And then his kingdom will appear in his entire creation' (10:1). In reaction to Taxo's faithfulness to the law and his death, God will intervene definitively by bringing the devil to an end and establishing

---

[1] This and all subsequent quotations from the Assumption of Moses are taken from J. Tromp, *The Assumption of Moses. A Critical Edition with Commentary* (SVTP 10; Leiden/New York/Köln: E.J. Brill, 1993).

[2] U. Kellermann, *Auferstanden*, pp. 94-95. The reference to blood (9:7) implies that, despite their retreat in a cave, Taxo and his sons died a violent death; J. Tromp, *Assumption*, p. 227.

[3] J. Tromp has made a good case for the identification of the *nuntius* mentioned in 10:2 with Taxo; J. Tromp, 'Taxo, the Messenger of the Lord', *JSJ* 21 (1990), pp. 200-209; J. Tromp, *Assumption*, pp. 229-231. If this suggestion is correct, Taxo is supposed to have been vindicated through a resurrection in heaven.

salvation for the righteous ones of Israel. The blood of Taxo and his sons will indeed be avenged.

The martyrdom of Taxo and his sons is presented as the prelude to the end of time, the coming of God's kingdom and the last judgement. The author places Taxo's martyrdom within an eschatological framework. The evil time in which Taxo lives, which is actually the author's own time, is presented as the climax of evil which precedes the definitive end, the day of judgement (As. Mos. 7-8).[1] Taxo and his sons provoke God's reaction by their atoning deaths[2] and their cry for vindication. The martyrdom of Taxo elicits the end of time.[3] It is in reaction to the deaths of Taxo and his sons that God rises from his royal throne and goes out 'with anger and wrath on account of his sons' (10:3). In other words, Taxo's martyrdom is presented as the beginning of the eschaton.

The differences between Paul's opinion that Jesus' martyrological resurrection is the beginning of the eschatological resurrection and the idea that Taxo's martyrdom is the beginning of the eschaton are considerable. The first and most important difference is, of course, that what inaugurates the events of the last day in the case of Jesus is his resurrection, whereas in Taxo's case it is his death.[4] Secondly, Jesus triggers the eschatological resurrection, whereas Taxo elicits the eschatological events in general. Nevertheless, the two passages agree in that they give a martyrdom an essential function within the run-down of the eschatological events. In the idea that Jesus' martyrological resurrection is the beginning of the eschatological resurrection, as well as in the idea that Taxo's martyrdom will inaugurate the last day, the events of the end of time are presented as being determined by the fate of a martyr, someone who gives his life for the cause of God.

(3) Paul's idea that Jesus' resurrection is the beginning of the eschatological resurrection has no real parallel in Jewish thought of Paul's time. Yet, the idea is not completely without analogy. Paul's interpretation of Jesus' martyrological resurrection as belonging to the end of time corresponds, to some extent, to the presentation of the martyrdom

---

[1] See L.J. Lietaert Peerbolte, *Antichrist*, pp. 296-299.

[2] For the references to atonement in the story about Taxo, see J. Tromp, *Assumption*, pp. 226-227, 231.

[3] J. Licht, 'Taxo, or the Apocalyptic Doctrine of Vengeance', *JJS* 12 (1961), pp. 95-103.

[4] This is the case even if the *nuntius* is to be identified with Taxo; that is, even if Taxo is raised.

of Taxo and his seven sons as the prelude to the end of time in Assumption of Moses 9 - 10. Christians were not the first to interpret the fate of a martyr in light of the coming end of time. Jews had done so previously.

PART FOUR

THE ESCHATOLOGICAL RESURRECTION AS A PARTICIPATION IN JESUS' RESURRECTION

Part four of this study will offer a traditio-historical analysis of the idea that the eschatological resurrection will take place through participation in Jesus' resurrection (1 Cor. 15:20). First, in chapter XI, the articulations of this idea outside of 1 Cor. 15:20 will be examined. It will be shown that the basis of this idea is the conviction that Christians live in unity with Christ. Subsequently, in chapter XII, the contents and origin of this concept of the Christians' unity with Christ will be investigated. Then, in chapter XIII, it will be shown how Paul related the notion of the unity between Christ and his followers to the concept of resurrection; that is, how Paul developed the idea of the eschatological resurrection as a participation in Jesus' resurrection. Finally, in chapter XIV, attention will be given to two ideas closely related to the idea of participation in Jesus' resurrection: (a) the notion of 'dying and rising with Christ', which Christians experience, for instance, in baptism (Rom. 6:4); (b) the idea that after Jesus' second coming his followers will live in community with him (e.g., 1 Thess. 4:17).

XI. THE IDEA OF THE ESCHATOLOGICAL RESURRECTION AS A PARTICIPATION IN JESUS' RESURRECTION

(1) In chapter II it was argued that Paul's idea that 'all people will be made alive in Christ' (1 Cor. 15:22) is based on the concept of the Christians' unity with Christ. Because of and through their unity with Christ, Christians will participate in Jesus' resurrection. First of all this idea is reflected in Paul's presentation of the risen Jesus as the first-fruits (ἀπαρχή) of those who have fallen asleep. Jesus has been raised as their 'representative'. This means that the others, those whom he represents, will participate in his resurrection.[1] Subsequently, Paul compares Christ, in whose resurrection Christians participate, with Adam, in whose death all people participate.[2] Finally, Paul's comment that all will be made alive 'in Christ',[3] which means that 'those who are of Christ' (οἱ τοῦ Χριστοῦ) will follow Christ in his resurrection (v. 23), is a further indication that Paul's presentation of the eschatological resurrection is based on the concept of the Christians' unity with Christ. In short, Paul elaborates the notion that Christians are united with Christ in such a way that it includes the idea that Christians will share in the resurrection of Jesus at the end of time.

(2) In Rom. 8:1-17 Paul discusses the idea that there is no condemnation for 'those who are in Christ Jesus' (v. 1). Because of their bond with Christ established through the Spirit, Christians are free from 'the law of sin and death' (v. 2). They do not have the mind of the flesh anymore but the mind of the Spirit. Their bodies are dead with regard to sin but their spirits are alive with regard to righteousness. Consequently, Paul states in verse 11: 'If the Spirit of him who raised Jesus from the dead dwells in you, he who raised Christ from the dead will give life to your mortal bodies also through his Spirit that dwells in you.'[4] In other words, Christians will be raised through and because of their possession of the same Spirit which was in Jesus. Thus, Paul extends the idea of living in unity with Christ through the Spirit in such a

---

[1] See chapter II, pp. 49-51.

[2] See chapter II, pp. 55-56.

[3] The phrase ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ describes the way through which people will be made alive, namely through their unity with Christ; see chapter II, p. 52.

[4] For ζωοποιεῖν as a synonym for ἐγείρειν, see chapter II, p. 54, note 2.

way that it includes the notion that Christians are united with Christ in his resurrection. This unity will result in their own resurrection at the end of time. The (eschatological) resurrection with Christ is presented as the effect of the Christians' unity with Christ.

In verses 15-17 of the same chapter the theme of the unity of Christians with Christ returns. In imitation of Christ, Christians may consider themselves to be children of God, Paul sets out. And because Christians are children of God they are 'joint heirs with Christ' (vv. 16-17). This means that a Christian may suffer with Christ (συμπάσχειν), but then also be glorified with Christ (συνδοξάζεσθαι). Being glorified with Christ and inheriting with Christ are eschatological events, that is, they will take place on the last day.[1] One may therefore consider the idea of 'being glorified with Christ' (v. 17) to be a parallel to the idea of 'being raised with Christ' (v. 11). The unity with Christ will lead to sharing in the eternal glory of Christ (v. 17), if necessary, through the Christians' resurrection, which will be a participation in Jesus' resurrection (8:11).[2]

In accordance with the idea that Christians will share in the eternal glory of Christ found in Rom. 8:17, Phil. 3:21 and 1 Cor. 15:51-52 convey the idea that Christians who are still alive at the time of Jesus' coming from heaven will be transformed to Jesus' glory. When Jesus comes 'he will transform the body of our humiliation that it may be conformed to the body of his glory' (Phil. 3:21). This transformation on the last day will be a conformation to the glory which Jesus already possesses. In other words, it will be a sharing in his glory.[3] Paul speaks once again about the transformation of the Christians who will be alive at Jesus' coming from heaven in 1 Cor. 15:51-52, and again he presents this transformation as a conformation to Jesus' glorious status. Here, the transformation and resurrection are seen as two parts of the same event. Just as the dead will be raised to immortality and bear the image (εἰκών) of the 'heavenly' (Jesus; vv. 48-49), those who will be alive will be transformed. They, too, will be clothed with immortality and imperishability (vv. 50-52).[4]

---

[1] Being glorified with Christ is essentially the same as being conformed to the glorious image of Christ (Rom. 8:29; 2 Cor. 3:18; 1 Cor. 15:49; Phil. 3:21); see below.

[2] Cf. Rom. 14:8, 'so then, whether we live or whether we die, we are the Lord's.'

[3] See chapter IV, p. 74. Compare Rom. 8:29; see chapter VIII, pp. 134-135.

[4] This last idea that those who are still alive at the time of Jesus' parousia will put on immortality is also found in 2 Cor. 5:1-5. Those alive at the end of time will be 'overclothed'; that is, they will receive the clothing of immortality while still living in the clothes of mortality. See chapter IV, pp. 72-74. In contrast to 1 Cor. 15:51-52 and Phil. 3:21, Paul does not compare in 2 Cor. 5:1-5 the glory with which one is to be over-

Thus, the concept of the unity of Christ and the believers also underlies Paul's idea of the eschatological transformation.[1] Whether by means of resurrection or direct transformation, Christians will be conformed to Jesus' glory through and as a result of their unity with Christ. The unity with Christ which Christians already enjoy will be extended at the end of time so as to comprise a unity in Christ's eternal glory.

(3) In Rom. 6:1-14 Paul uses the concept of baptism to illustrate his view that Christians are not subject to the power of sin anymore since they are under the dominion of God's grace through Jesus' act of righteousness (5:18-21).[2] Paul compares this switch of dominions with the transition from being buried to being made alive again, and relates this transition to the metastasis Jesus had gone through when he died and was raised from the dead. 'Therefore we have been buried with him by baptism into death,' Paul declares, 'so that, just as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, so we too might walk in newness of life' (Rom. 6:4). This participation in Jesus' death and resurrection does not refer to one's physical death and subsequent resurrection at the end of time, but to a death and resurrection which took place at the time when one became a Christian. It is a death and resurrection with Christ experienced in the past and symbolized by one's baptism. Becoming a Christian is a dying and coming to life again. More precisely, it is a dying and living with Christ. Or, as Paul states in verse 13, it is a being brought from death to life. In Rom. 6:4 the believers' participation in Jesus' resurrection at the end of time, the eschatological resurrection, as discussed in 1 Cor. 15:21-22 and Rom. 8:11, is not in view.

In verse 5, however, the idea of the eschatological resurrection as a participation in Jesus' resurrection does come to the fore. In verse 5 Paul elaborates on the idea of a Christian's change of dominions by stating that 'if we have been united with him in a death like his, we will

---

clothed with Jesus' state of glory, nor does he present this event as the result of the Christians' unity with Christ.

[1] The idea of the Christian's conformation to the image (εἰκών) of Jesus is also present in 2 Cor. 3:18. However, contrary to Rom. 8:17, Phil. 3:21, and 1 Cor. 15:51-52, Paul states in 2 Cor. 3:18 that the conformation is a gradual process which has already started for each Christian from the time he or she became a Christian.

[2] Baptism itself is not the theme of the pericope (Rom. 6:1-14), it is only an example which Paul uses to explain that a Christian has changed from the dominion of sin to that of grace. See A.J.M. Wedderburn, *Baptism*, pp. 49-50, and the literature listed there; J.D.G. Dunn, *Romans*, p. 308.

certainly be united with him in a resurrection like his.' In verse 4 Paul speaks about man's unity with Christ in his death and resurrection, resulting in the receipt of newness of life. In verse 5, however, Paul says that man's unity with Christ's death and resurrection will result in the eschatological resurrection with Christ. The unity with Christ in a 'resurrection like his' (v. 5) is man's participation in Jesus' resurrection at the end of time; that is, in the eschatological resurrection.

Two arguments support this understanding of verse 5. Firstly, the language which Paul uses in verse 5 is different from that of verse 4. In verse 4 Paul speaks about *newness of life* as the result of having died with Christ, in verse 5 Paul speaks about a *resurrection* with Christ. Although it cannot be maintained that resurrection language, including the word ἀνάστασις (v. 5), refers exclusively to the eschatological resurrection,[1] the differentiation of language between verses 4 and 5 demands an explanation. In verse 4, then, Paul speaks about the situation following baptism: the newness of life in accordance with (ὥσπερ) Jesus' resurrection. In verse 5 Paul speaks about becoming one with Jesus (σύμφυτος γίνεσθαι) in a resurrection like his.

Secondly, in verse 5 Paul uses a future tense (ἐσόμεθα), thereby making a distinction between living *now* for God in newness of life (v. 4) versus being raised with Jesus *in the future*.[2] This distinction is present throughout the pericope. In verse 11 Paul states that Christians must consider themselves living (ζῶντας) for God in Christ Jesus, that is, resurrected from the dead (ὡσεὶ ἐκ νεκρῶν ζῶντας; v. 13).[3] Yet, in verse 8, in extension of verse 5, Paul states in the future tense that Christians will live with him (συζήσομεν).[4] 'Living with him' here means living in community with Jesus in the new aeon, after Jesus'

---

[1] In Rom. 1:4, for instance, Paul uses the word ἀνάστασις for Jesus' resurrection; see chapter VIII, pp. 133-134. It will be argued in chapter XIV, pp. 191-194, that in 2 Cor. 4:14 Paul uses the verb ἐγείρειν as referring to a different kind of resurrection than the eschatological resurrection and Jesus' resurrection.

[2] It is generally agreed that the future tenses in verses 5 and 8 indicate that the actions described will take place sometime in the future (on the last day). The opinion that the future tenses are used only for logical (argumentative) reasons, and that they do not refer to the future but to the present, is implausible; see P. Siber, *Mit Christus leben*, pp. 242-243, and the literature listed there; A.J.M. Wedderburn, *Baptism*, p. 44; J.D.G. Dunn, *Romans*, p. 318.

[3] The phrase ὡσεὶ ἐκ νεκρῶν ζῶντας (v. 13) means 'living as people who have passed from (the state of) the dead;' A.J.M. Wedderburn, *Baptism*, pp. 44-45.

[4] The variant reading συζήσωμεν which occurs in a few manuscripts is only an orthographic variant: it is a future indicative, not an aorist subjunctive.

coming in glory from heaven (see 1 Thess. 4:17; 5:10).[1] Furthermore, Paul says he 'believes' (πιστεύομεν; v. 8) that 'we shall live with him.' This shows clearly that life with Christ is something he expects for the future. In contrast to this 'belief' Paul 'knows' (v. 3) that one already walks in newness of life after becoming a Christian.[2]

In Rom. 6:1-14 Paul thus speaks about being united in Christ's death and resurrection in two ways. Firstly, by becoming a Christian one has already been united with Jesus in his death and resurrection. The result of this dying and rising with Christ is the Christian's death to sin and newness of life. This dying and rising with Christ, symbolized in baptism, is a change of dominions, from the dominion of sin (death) to that of grace (life).[3] Secondly, as a result of this participation in Jesus' death and resurrection in the past a Christian will also participate in Jesus' resurrection in the future, at the end of time. If someone has been united with Jesus in his death, he may believe that he will also be united with Jesus in his resurrection at the end of time (v. 5). The latter idea concurs with Paul's view on the eschatological resurrection as a participation in Jesus' resurrection as found in 1 Cor. 15:21-22 and Rom. 8:11. Here, as in 1 Cor. 15:21-22 and Rom. 8:11, the idea of the eschatological resurrection as a participation in Jesus' resurrection is rooted in the notion of the Christians' unity with Christ. The unity with Christ in which Christians live will result in a unity in Jesus' resurrection in the future.

(4) Although the eschatological resurrection in 1 Thess. 4:14-17 is not explicitly presented as a participation in Jesus' resurrection, the concept of the eschatological resurrection in this passage presupposes the idea that Christ and Christians form a unity. First of all, Paul speaks about those who will be raised as 'the dead in Christ' (οἱ νεκροὶ ἐν Χριστῷ).[4] Despite their death, the dead are still united with Christ and, because of this unity, they will be raised. The condition necessary in order to be raised is to be 'in Christ'. Secondly, the resurrection is described as an action of God who will 'lead the dead together with (σύν) Jesus.' Paul compares this action of God to God's act of raising Jesus in the past: 'For since we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so,

---

[1] J.D.G. Dunn, *Romans*, p. 322; for a further examination of this idea, see chapter XIV, pp. 198-202.

[2] See R.C. Tannehill, *Dying and Rising*, p. 10; J.D.G. Dunn, *Romans*, p. 322.

[3] For a further discussion of this idea, see chapter XIV, pp. 188-202.

[4] The phrase ἐν Χριστῷ is to be connected here with the noun (οἱ νεκροί) and not with the verb (ἀναστήσονται); see chapter I, p. 46, note 2.

through Jesus,[1] God will bring with him those who have died' (v. 14). In other words, the unity with Christ in which Christians, the dead included, find themselves is the ground for their future resurrection. This future resurrection will be in accordance with Jesus' resurrection.

After Jesus' coming in glory and the believers' resurrection, all will live for ever in community with Christ (σὺν Χριστῷ; 4:17; 5:10). The idea of the eschatological association with Christ is to be distinguished from the idea that Christ and the Christians, alive and dead, are already united.[2] Here Paul combines the two types of unity with Christ and he presents the one as leading to the other. The unity of the Christians with Christ will be continued in an eschatological community with Christ, and the latter will be realized by means of a resurrection of those who have died before Jesus' return.

In short, although Paul does not write in 1 Thess. 4:14-17 that Christians will be raised through participation in Christ's resurrection, nevertheless Paul's presentation of the eschatological resurrection here is influenced by the idea that Christians and Christ are united.

(5) In 1 Cor. 6:14 Paul is no more explicit as to the role which participation in Jesus' resurrection will play in the eschatological resurrection. Nevertheless, Paul does relate the eschatological resurrection to the resurrection of Jesus. He states: 'God raised the Lord and will also raise us by his power.' Paul's statement about the future resurrection of the Corinthians functions as an argument in his plea against the sexual abuses in Corinth. The Corinthians must not defile their bodies for they will be raised just as Jesus has been raised.[3]

In verses 15-20 Paul supplies several additional arguments against sexual misbehaviour. All of these arguments are based on the idea that Christ and the Christians form a unity. Because Christians are members of the body of Christ, that is, are united with Christ through the Spirit, they must not unite themselves with a prostitute (vv. 15-17). Moreover, the Holy Spirit dwells in them with the result that they do not belong to themselves (v. 19). Therefore, the Corinthians should shun defiling their 'temples' by fornication.

In comparing the future resurrection of the Corinthians with the resurrection of Jesus in verse 14, Paul does not explicitly state that the

---

[1] The phrase 'through Jesus' (διὰ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ) is a general reference to Jesus as the basis and the instrument of God's actions; see chapter IV, p. 71.

[2] See chapter XIV, pp. 200-201.

[3] See also chapter V, pp. 77-78.

Corinthians will be raised through participation in Jesus' resurrection. However, the comparison does presuppose the idea that Christians live in unity with Christ. Furthermore, the idea that Christians are united with Christ is Paul's main argument against the Corinthian practice of fornication.

(6) In the passages on the eschatological resurrection discussed above, the concept of the Christians' unity with Christ plays an important role.[1] In 1 Cor. 15:22, Rom. 8:11, and Rom. 6:5 Paul affirms that on the last day Christians will participate in Jesus' resurrection as a result of and through their unity with Christ. In 1 Thess. 4:14-17 and 1 Cor. 6:14 the idea of the Christians' unity with Christ plays a more distant role, yet it is constitutive for the concept of the eschatological resurrection. The view that the eschatological resurrection is a participation in Jesus' resurrection was probably developed by Paul himself, for the idea is not found outside the Pauline corpus and there are no indications that Paul adopted this view from Christian tradition. In his speculation that the eschatological resurrection will occur through participation in Jesus' resurrection, Paul elaborates the idea that Christ and the Christians are one. He simply infers that the unity in which Christians live with Christ will entail a participation in his resurrection. By presenting the eschatological resurrection as a participation in the resurrection of Jesus, Paul connects two central themes of his preaching: that of the Christians' unity with Christ and that of Jesus' resurrection. The origin of the belief in Jesus' resurrection was already examined in chapter IX. Attention must now be turned, therefore, to the concept of the Christians' unity with Christ.

[1] It is unnecessary to examine here 2 Cor. 4:14 and 13:4. Although Paul does speak there about a resurrection in comparison with Jesus' resurrection, this resurrection is not the eschatological resurrection but a metaphorical resurrection; see chapter XIV, pp. 190-194. Nor does Phil. 3:10-11 need to be examined. There Paul does not compare the eschatological resurrection, but his own martyrological resurrection, with Jesus' resurrection; see chapter IX, pp. 153-154. It is noteworthy, however, that Paul does use the concept of the unity with Christ for this comparison.

XII. THE CONCEPT OF THE CHRISTIANS' UNITY WITH CHRIST

An often recurrent theme in Paul's letters is that Jesus' followers, although separated from Christ, live in unity with him. This theme plays a role in many of the apostle's ideas and comes to expression in various turns of phrase. The notion of the Christians' unity with Christ is perhaps most characteristically expressed in such phrases as 'in Christ', 'through Christ', and 'with Christ'; expressions which Paul uses frequently in his argumentation. The concept of the Christians' unity with Christ in all its variations cannot be studied exhaustively here. Only two aspects of this concept will be analysed presently. This analysis, however, will offer an insight into the traditional background of the concept. First, Paul's use of the traditional Jewish view of Abraham and Adam as representative figures through whom God causes his will to be accomplished will be examined. Just as all nations are united with Abraham and all humans with Adam, so all Christians are united with Christ. These ideas of unity are ramifications of the widespread ancient concept of unity and solidarity between a group of people and their leader or representative (section a). Second, the idea that Jesus brought about reconciliation between God and his people through his vicarious death will be investigated (section b). This idea stems from Jewish tradition and is also based on the ancient theme of unity and solidarity between a group of people and their leader or representative.

a. *Abraham, Adam, and Jesus as representative figures*

(1) One of the most characteristic features of Paul's reflection on the Christians' unity with Christ is his use of the expressions 'in Christ', 'through Christ', and 'with Christ' (insofar as this phrase does not refer to the eschatological association with Christ).[1] The demand for a fresh study of Paul's use of these phrases has not yet been fulfilled.[2]

---

[1] For an examination of the idea of the eschatological association with Christ, see chapter XIV, pp. 198-202.

[2] See A.J.M. Wedderburn, 'Observations', p. 83. Wedderburn refers to Schnelle's complaints about the absence of such a study; see U. Schnelle, *Gerechtigkeit und Christusgegenwart: vorpaulinische und paulinische Tauftheologie* (GTA 24; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1983), p. 107. Schnelle himself argues that the 'in Christ' language stems from wisdom traditions; U. Schnelle, *Gerechtigkeit*, pp. 108-109.

Some work, however, has been done with regard to the ideas connected with the expressions mentioned, especially by A.J.M. Wedderburn.[1] He argues that Paul uses these phrases to express the idea that a Christian lives in unity with Christ and receives God's grace as a consequence of this unity. The phrases 'in Christ', 'through Christ', and 'with Christ' have a local and an instrumental flavour.[2] Wedderburn claims that the idea of unity expressed in these phrases goes back to the ancient Near-Eastern concept of solidarity and unity between a group of people and their representative, leader, or patriarch.[3] He sustains his thesis by showing that Paul compares the unity between Christ and his followers with that between the nations and Abraham, based on God's promise to Abraham (Gal. 3:8-9), and with the unity of all humans with Adam, reposing on the fact that the latter brought death to all his descendants (1 Cor. 15:21-22; Rom. 5:12-21). The idea of the nations' participation in God's promise to Abraham as well as the idea that all humans share in the death of Adam reflect Jewish traditions based on the current ancient concept of unity and solidarity between a group of people and their representative; in this case, a patriarch representing his descendants. Wedderburn comes to the convincing conclusion that this ancient concept of unity also underlies the Christian concept of the believers' unity with Christ.

(2) In Gal. 3:8-9 Paul compares Jesus and Abraham as representative figures. Citing Gen. 18:18, he sets out that the nations are blessed in (ἐν) Abraham. This means, according to the apostle, that the nations are blessed with (σύν, v. 9) Abraham insofar as they unite with Abraham in his faith, for it was because of his faith that Abraham was justified (Gal. 3:6). In receiving God's blessing, Abraham represents all the nations and the nations share in the blessing of Abraham if they join him in his faith. Christ, according to Paul, has brought about the realization of this blessing which God bestowed on the nations in Abraham. Christ is Abraham's successor in mediating the blessing to the nations. It is 'in Christ Jesus' (ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ) that the blessing

---

[1] A.J.M. Wedderburn, 'Observations', *passim*; A.J.M. Wedderburn, 'The Body of Christ and Related Concepts in 1 Corinthians', *SJTh* 24 (1971), pp. 74-95; A.J.M. Wedderburn, *Baptism*, pp. 342-356. The present chapter leans heavily on Wedderburn's results.

[2] A.J.M. Wedderburn, 'Body', p. 98.

[3] Wedderburn rejects the term 'corporate personality' which became standard for this idea of unity or solidarity in earlier literature. The term appears to be too vague and therefore misleading; A.J.M. Wedderburn, *Baptism*, pp. 351-356. Cf. the section on the history of earlier research, p. 22.

announced to the nations via Abraham is being realized (Gal. 3:14). The blessing promised to those who unite with Abraham in his faith will be fulfilled for those who are 'in Christ'.

Wedderburn concludes that the unity of the nations with Abraham, rooted in the blessing which the patriarch received, is comparable with the unity between the Christians and Christ. The nations are blessed 'in Abraham', which means that they will share 'with Abraham' in the blessing given to him. Similarly, Christians, those who are 'in Christ', share in the grace which Christ mediates, namely, justification by God. Abraham and Christ are both the place and the instrument of God's grace. Thus, the unity of the nations with Abraham runs parallel to the unity of the Christians with Christ. Consequently, Wedderburn surmises that Paul's use of the prepositions ἐν and σύν in this passage, both in relation to Abraham and Christ, may offer a key for understanding the apostle's use of the phrases 'in Christ' and 'with Christ' elsewhere. This supposition remains to be substantiated.[1] But Wedderburn is correct in taking Abraham and Christ as persons who are comparable, both as representatives of the nations and as persons through whom God mediates his grace.

The idea that Abraham and Christ can mediate God's grace to the nations is rooted in the idea of solidarity and unity between a representative, leader, or patriarch, on the one hand, and his people (nation), on the other.[2] Wedderburn shows that this idea was current in the cultures of the ancient Near-East, including the world of the Old Testament, and that traces of it can be found in the Graeco-Roman world as well.[3] He adduces a wide range of traditions contained in the Old Testament in which the idea of unity and solidarity between a representative and his group comes to the fore.[4] It is reflected, for instance, in

---

[1] Wedderburn rightly argues that Paul's use of the preposition ἐν in verse 8 (ἐν σοί) is similar to that in verse 14 (ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ). In both instances the preposition has a local and an instrumental flavour; A.J.M. Wedderburn, 'Body', p. 89. In other passages, however, the phrase 'in Christ' has only the (inclusive) local flavour; see, for instance, Phil. 1:1; Rom. 8:1. In these cases the parallelism with the idea of being 'in Abraham' is harder to prove.

[2] A.J.M. Wedderburn, 'Observations', pp. 90-91; A.J.M. Wedderburn, *Baptism*, pp. 342-356; see also F. Mussner, *Der Galaterbrief* (HThK; Freiburg/Basel/Wien: Herder, 1974), pp. 222-223.

[3] A.J.M. Wedderburn, *Baptism*, p. 345.

[4] It is clear that unity or solidarity between a leader and his people is not a concept which is found at the surface of texts, for instance, as an issue of discussion or reflection. It is a concept presupposed in a number of other ideas, notions, and accounts of events.

the conviction that the sin of one person involves many,[1] or that a king[2] or priest[3] can represent a whole nation.[4]

(3) At this point it may be useful to examine more closely one particular form of the idea of unity and solidarity mentioned above, namely, the belief that all the nations share in the blessing God gave to Abraham.

The view that a blessing or a curse can be conveyed to the offspring of the person to whom the blessing or curse was originally addressed, is traditional in the Old Testament.[5] This view is worked out in the book of Jubilees with regard to the blessing given to Abraham, the patriarch of Israel, and all the nations. Quite often the author of Jubilees alludes to the blessing given to Abraham and his offspring as it is recorded, for instance, in Gen. 12:2, 22:18, and 26:4. In accordance with these passages the author states more than once that all the nations will share in the blessing of Abraham: 'All the nations of the earth will be blessed in you' (12:23;[6] see also 18:16; 19:20; 21:25). In line with Gen. 12:2 and 22:18, the author of Jubilees, just like Paul, explains that all the nations, and not only Israel, will share in the blessing bestowed on Abraham.

Of particular interest is the fact that in the book of Jubilees a patriarch and 'his seed' are sometimes hardly distinguished. In 27:23 the author reports that God said to Jacob at Bethel: 'All the families of the nations will be blessed through you and your descendants' (27:23).[7] Here, Jacob ('you') and the descendants of Jacob ('your descendants')

---

[1] For instance in Num. 16:22; 2 Sam. 24:17.

[2] For instance in 2 Kgs. 23:26.

[3] For instance in Exod. 18:19; Lev. 16:11.

[4] A.J.M. Wedderburn, 'Body', p. 84; A.J.M. Wedderburn, *Baptism*, pp. 343-346.

[5] J. Scharbert, *Solidarität in Segen und Fluch im Alten Testament und in seiner Umwelt. I. Väterfluch und Vätersegen* (BBB 14; Bonn: P. Hanstein, 1958).

[6] This and subsequent quotations from the book of Jubilees are taken from J.C. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees* (CSCO 511[Aeth. 88]; Louvain: Peeters, 1989).

[7] The variation in the use of the prepositions 'in' (12:23) and 'through' (18:16; 27:23) in the translation by VanderKam does not go back to a corresponding variation in the Ethiopic text. In all instances all Ethiopic manuscripts use the preposition *ba* which has the same range of meanings as the Hebrew ב in the Masoretic text. It is generally assumed that the book of Jubilees was originally written in Hebrew and that the Ethiopic translation was made directly from the Hebrew; J.C. VanderKam, *Jubilees*, p. VI. In the Latin version of Jub. 27:23 and 18:16 (in the Latin fragments 12:23 is lacking) the preposition *in* is used twice (Gen. 12:2 Vulgate: *in te benedicentur*). The Greek fragments of the book of Jubilees contain none of these passages. In the Syriac fragments only one of the passages mentioned is found, namely 12:23. There ב is used in accordance with the Peshitta of Genesis.

are perceived as equal representatives or members of one whole. Similarly, in 21:25, Isaac is even identified with his descendants. Abraham says to Isaac that God will bless 'all your descendants—the remnant of your descendants—throughout the history of eternity with every proper blessing so that you may become a blessing throughout the entire earth.' Here 'you' stands for Isaac's descendants. It is through his offspring that he will become a blessing for the nations of all times.[1] The unity between the patriarch and his descendants (his seed) is so self-evident that a reference to the patriarch can take the place of a reference to the seed of the patriarch.[2]

There is another point of interest in what the author of Jubilees says about the blessing given to Abraham and his offspring. The idea that Isaac and Jacob take over Abraham's role as mediator of God's blessing to the nations is comparable with Paul's idea in Gal. 3:6-14 that the mediatory role of Abraham has been taken over by Christ. In Jubilees, Isaac and Jacob take over the blessing which Abraham received from God: they will be patriarchs of a multitude of people and all the nations will share in their fortune.[3] The condition for this transference of the blessing is that, just like Abraham, they obey God's commands. Abraham gives his blessing to Isaac and Jacob together with a long list of commandments which he has received from God. Isaac and Jacob must obey the commandments. God will renew with Isaac and Jacob the covenant which he made with Abraham as long as they 'keep the commandments of Abraham,' their father (22:16). Thus, the transference of the mediatory role of Abraham to Isaac and Jacob proves to be not only dependent on a physical relationship between them, in the sense that Isaac and Jacob are Abraham's flesh and blood. There is also a spiritual relationship between the three patriarchs in the sense that Isaac and Jacob have to walk in the way of their (grand)father.[4]

Similarly, in order to be able to take over the mediatory role of Abraham for the nations, Jesus is linked to Abraham both physically and spiritually. According to Paul, Jesus is Abraham's physical offspring in the singular (Gal. 3:16). Yet, Jesus is also related to Abraham

---

[1] See also 19:20: 'He (=Jacob) will prove to be a blessing for us (=Abraham and Rebecca) on the earth from now and throughout all the history of the earth.'

[2] The interchangeability of references to the descendants of the patriarch and the patriarch himself in the book of Jubilees is comparable with the way the name Jacob is used as a reference to the patriarch and to the people descending from him, Israel. See, for instance, Micah 7:20 where not only the name of Jacob, but also that of Abraham, is used as a reference to the people of Israel.

[3] See, for instance, 19:27; 21:25; 22:13.

[4] Cf. J. Scharbert, *Solidarität*, p. 266.

in a spiritual way in that both acquired justification through faith, not through works of the law. Abraham was justified on account of his faith, not because of his works of the law (Gal. 3:6). Then, in the time after Abraham, the law came as a 'disciplinarian' (3:24), but it did not bring any possibility for people to be justified through it. On the contrary, it placed humanity under a curse. Christ, however, by redeeming humanity from the curse of the law through his death (3:13), made it possible again to be justified by God. People will not receive this justification because of works of the law, but, just like Abraham, only through faith. Thus, both Abraham and Jesus have shown that God justifies people because of their faith, not because of their works of the law. This is the spiritual bond between Abraham and Jesus. Because Jesus and Abraham are spiritually connected, Jesus can take over from Abraham the mediatory role which the latter performed in making the nations share in his blessing.

For Paul the spiritual bond between Abraham and Christ is of great importance, since the factor which brings about their bond, that is, faith, can also make the nations share in the unity between Abraham and Jesus—and this is the objective for which Paul aims. Through faith the nations can unite with Abraham and Christ. As to the question of how the nations can come to share in the blessing bestowed on Abraham, Paul and Jubilees disagree. In Jubilees the nations share only marginally in the blessing of Abraham. The nations are not united with Abraham as fully as his offspring is. In Paul's view the nations are fully united with Abraham through faith. The apostle holds that the nations share equally with the patriarch's offspring in his blessing as long as they believe like Abraham did. Those who share in Abraham's faith may consider themselves to be his 'sons' (υἱοί; Gal. 3:6-7). Paul offers the nations a much more favourable prospect than the author of Jubilees does.

It can be concluded that Paul was not the only author in ancient Judaism who advocated the view that all the nations, and not only Abraham's offspring, could share in the blessing given to the patriarch. Furthermore, both in Paul and in the book of Jubilees, the blessing given to Abraham is a theme which is used to express the idea of unity or solidarity between a representative and his people. In the book of Jubilees the patriarch and his offspring are so closely united that a reference to the one can imply a reference to the other. While the nations may not be so closely related to the patriarch as his immediate offspring, they do share in the blessing given to the patriarch. In Paul's view the nations can share in the blessing given to the patriarch on the

same footing as his offspring. Finally, in Paul as well as in the book of Jubilees, the unity between the patriarch and his descendants is both physical and spiritual. More strongly than Jubilees, the apostle emphasizes the spiritual character of this unity, for this enables him to make the nations share in the unity on the same footing as Abraham's offspring.

(4) As the representative of a group, Jesus is not only compared by Paul with Abraham, but also with Adam. In 1 Cor. 15:21-22 Paul argues that all people are united with Adam in his death. This idea of man's unity with Adam is clarified in Rom. 5:12-21, where Paul contends that it is through sin that people are united with Adam, also with his death. According to Paul, sin, and thereby death, are hereditary, not physically but spiritually. Everybody sins and thereby calls death upon himself of his own accord. Nevertheless, sin and death have been brought into the world by Adam, the first one who sinned and, as a result, died. As a consequence, all people can be said to sin and die because of Adam (5:12).[1] Thus, the unity of humankind with Adam is spiritual rather than physical.

Paul's view on Adam's sin and death derives from Jewish tradition. The idea that death came into the world through Adam's sin and, therefore, all people die, is found in numerous passages in Jewish literature.[2] Furthermore, these same passages also betray the idea that the unity of humankind with Adam is of a spiritual rather than a physical nature. In 2 Apoc. Bar. 54:15, for instance, the author makes it clear, as Paul does in Rom. 5:12, that each person calls death upon himself through his sinful actions.[3] Paul's idea that Adam is humanity's representative in the sense that through and because of him all people sin and die, is firmly grounded in Jewish tradition.

Paul's use of 'in language' in this context (ἐν τῷ Ἀδάμ), however, is unparalleled. All people are 'in Adam' and therefore die, Paul writes in 1 Cor. 15:22. Paul's use of the preposition 'in' in this connection is probably inspired by the following 'in Christ' (ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ).

---

[1] The phrase ἐφ' ᾧ in ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον still seems to be translated most accurately with 'because' or 'for this reason'; cf. 2 Cor. 5:4; E. Brandenburger, *Adam und Christus*, pp. 175-180; J.D.G. Dunn, *Romans*, pp. 273-274; U. Wilckens, *Römer*, p. 312. Cf. J.A. Fitzmyer, 'The Consecutive Meaning of ἐφ' ᾧ in Romans 5.12', *NTS* 39 (1993), pp. 321-339.

[2] See the passages listed in chapter II, p. 55.

[3] E. Brandenburger, *Adam und Christus*, p. 58; J.R. Levison, *Portraits*, pp. 156-159.

While Paul's language may be his own, the idea conveyed by it is not. In accordance with Jewish tradition he views Adam, just like Abraham (Gal. 3:8-9), as the representative of a group. Adam is the representative of all those who sin and die.[1] This view is one example among others of the idea of unity and solidarity between a representative and the people he represents. The unity in this case is that between the first man on earth and all his descendants.

(5) Paul's comparison of the unity between Jesus and his followers with the unity between Abraham and the nations as well as that between Adam and humanity warrants the conclusion that Paul models his concept of the Christians' unity with Christ on a traditional Jewish pattern. The idea that the nations share in the blessing given to Abraham as well as the idea that all people share in the death of Adam are traditional Jewish ideas. The root of all these ideas is the common ancient notion of the unity and solidarity between the representative, leader, or patriarch of a people and the people itself.

b. *Jesus' atoning death*

(1) The concept of the unity between Christ and the Christians is also exemplified in the idea of Jesus' atoning death. Soon after Jesus' death his followers proclaimed that through his death Jesus established reconciliation between God and the world. The earliest traces of the belief in Jesus' atoning death are preserved in the dying formula[2] and the surrender formula.[3] The formulaic expressions 'Jesus died for ...' and 'Jesus gave himself (his life) for ...' reflect the idea that Jesus died vicariously for others. As Paul puts it: 'One has died for all; therefore all have died' (2 Cor. 5:14). By dying Jesus reconciled God and his people (2 Cor. 5:20; Rom. 5:9-10). The relationship between God and his people which was troubled by the people's sin, was restored by Jesus in that he gave up his life vicariously for the people. The longer expres-

---

[1] E. Best, *Body*, pp. 34-43; A.J.M. Wedderburn, 'Body', pp. 90-92.

[2] The dying formula is found, in varying forms, in 1 Thess. 5:10; Gal. 2:21; 3:13; 1 Cor. 1:13; 8:11; 2 Cor. 5:14, 15 (twice); Rom. 5:6, 8; 14:9, 15; 1 Pet. 2:21; Heb. 2:9; John 11:50, 51; 18:14; cf. Rom. 5:7; 9:3; Phil. 1:29; see also chapter IX, pp. 140-141 and the literature listed there.

[3] The surrender formula occurs, in varying forms, in Gal. 1:4; 2:20; Rom. 4:25; 8:32; Eph. 5:2, 25; Mark 10:45; 16:14 Freer logion; Matt. 20:28; 1 Tim. 2:6; Titus 2:14; see chapter IX, pp. 140-141 and the literature listed there.

sion 'Jesus has died for our sins' may therefore be seen as synonymous with the phrase 'Jesus died for us.'[1]

As others have convincingly argued, the Christian death and surrender formulas, as well as the idea of atonement through Jesus' death in general, are based on the Jewish tradition concerning the atoning death of martyrs.[2] The deaths of Eleazar and the seven brothers in 2 Maccabees 6 and 7 are described in language similar to the diction with which the death of Jesus is described. The seven martyrs are said to die for their people and by doing so they hope to still God's anger which, in their eyes, had fallen on their nation (2 Macc. 7:37-38). As the author relates in chapter 8 and onwards, God's anger did change into mercy. This is clear from the success with which Judas subsequently carried on his revolt (8:1-5) and from the fact that Judas' revolt resulted in an independent state of Judea and the restoration of the temple cult. When the author of 2 Maccabees wrote his account of the revolt, he concluded that its success was due to the sacrifice of those who gave up their lives[3] and died for[4] the laws and the Jewish nation. A new situation had come into being as a result of the reconciliation between God and Israel brought about by the martyrs.[5]

In accordance with the Jewish martyrological tradition just mentioned, followers of Jesus also interpreted the death of their master as a saving event. In their view, Jesus had died on behalf of the other members of his group, his followers. Consequently, these followers, and all

---

[1] See Rom. 5:1-11; M. de Jonge, 'Death', p. 145.

[2] See M. de Jonge, 'Death', *passim* and the literature listed there; see also C. Breytenbach, *Versöhnung. Eine Studie zur paulinischen Soteriologie* (WMANT 60; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1988), pp. 198-199; H.J. de Jonge, 'Setting', p. 231; W. Kraus, *Der Tod Jesu als Heiligtumsweihe. Eine Untersuchung zum Umfeld der Sühnevorstellung in Römer 3,25-26a* (WMANT 66; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1991), pp. 33-36; M. de Jonge, *Jesus*, pp. 42-48; R. Bieringer, 'Traditionsgeschichtlicher Ursprung und theologische Bedeutung der ὑπέρ-Aussagen im Neuen Testament', in: F. Van Segbroeck et alii (eds.), *The Four Gospels*, vol. I, pp. 219-248; C. Breytenbach, 'Versöhnung, Stellvertretung und Sühne. Semantische und traditionsgeschichtliche Bemerkungen am Beispiel der paulinischen Briefe', *NTS* 39 (1993), pp. 59-79. For a review of the recent discussion on the subject, see J.S. Vos, 'Vragen rondom de plaatsvervangende zoendood van Jezus in het Nieuwe Testament', *GTT* 93 (1993), pp. 210-231.

[3] 2 Macc. 7:37; see also 1 Macc. 2:50; 6:44; Josephus, *Bell. Jud.* II, 201; *Ant. Jud.* II, 159.

[4] 2 Macc. 8:21; 13:14. Although in 2 Maccabees the martyrs are not said to have died for others, but only for the laws and the nation, they do identify themselves with those among their people who had sinned; they hope to establish atonement for the nation.

[5] See J.W. van Henten, *De joodse martelaren als grondleggers van een nieuwe orde. Een studie uitgaande van 2 en 4 Makkabeeën* (Ph.D. diss., Leiden, 1986).

those who joined them after Jesus' death, could consider themselves a new creation (2 Cor. 5:17). From this perspective, Christians already belong to the glorious time to come, for they have been justified by Jesus' death. They will be saved, therefore, from God's wrath at the end of time (Rom. 5:8-10).

In order for a death to become a saving event for those who survive, the condition must be fulfilled that the one slain and the survivors form a unity. Only when this requisition is fulfilled can God's mercy, which is aroused by the death of the martyr, become effective for both the martyr, whom God raises, and the survivors, whom he justifies. This unity between martyrs and survivors is presupposed in 2 Maccabees as well as in the early Christian tradition about Jesus' death as saving event. In 2 Maccabees, the deaths of the seven brothers turns God's wrath into mercy. As a result, the revolt of Judas and those who had remained faithful to the Jewish religion becomes a success. God's reaction is only understandable if the seven brothers and the other faithful Jews are considered to have been closely connected. In the case of Jesus, too, the belief that his death brought about reconciliation between God and Jesus' followers is based on the supposition that Jesus and his followers formed a unity.

The notion of unity underlying the idea that a person can die for others is the same as that underlying the idea that a blessing can be conveyed to someone's offspring (see section a).[1] In the case of the deaths of the Maccabean martyrs, however, the idea of being a unity ultimately amounts to the national consciousness of the true Israel, God's chosen people. The author of 2 Maccabees believed that God had taken pity on Israel in response to the deaths of the martyrs. The author could only believe this if he presumed a priori that the martyrs and Israel formed one body. 2 Maccabees thus attests the existence of something like a Jewish consciousness of being God's people and the underlying persuasion that the observant Jews in Palestine formed the true Israel. This is confirmed by the fact that, according to 2 Maccabees, God's mercy leads to the liberation of Israel as an independent nation and the restoration of the temple cult.

It is not improbable that the consciousness of being God's chosen people was also alive in the group of Jesus' followers. His death could only be interpreted as having an atoning effect for his followers if the latter regarded themselves a priori as one body with Christ. This feel-

---

[1] See H.W. Robinson, 'Corporate Personality', pp. 55-56; W.H.C. Frend, *Martyrdom*, p. 45; A.J.M. Wedderburn, 'Body', p. 84; W. Kraus, *Tod*, p. 35.

ing of being one body with Christ may well amount to the consciousness of forming God's chosen people, the true Israel. The possibility cannot be ruled out, therefore, that the Christian belief in the atonement brought about by Christ is rooted in the Christian self-consciousness of being God's chosen people. The idea of unity between Christ and the Christians possibly coincides with this feeling of being the true Israel.

(2) One further conclusion can be drawn. Since the death and surrender formulas are of pre-Pauline origin, the idea of Jesus' reconciliatory death is a very early Christian tenet.[1] This means that the belief in the unity between Jesus and his followers must have existed in the Christian movement at a very early time. There is even reason to conclude that the unity between Jesus' followers and Jesus was something experienced and confessed in the time before Jesus' death. The idea that Jesus died vicariously for others could only arise as early as it did, if Jesus' followers already felt united with him before his death. They could interpret this death as an event of favourable consequences for themselves only because they already believed that Jesus had been the leader and representative of their group before he died. Even before Jesus' death, therefore, his followers must have felt closely attached to him. Those who remained faithful to him after his death must have believed in the unity between Christ and themselves from the moment their master lost his life.

The idea of the unity between Jesus and his followers was, of course, not so strong in the early stages of his ministry as in the time around and soon after his death. From his death onward, however, Christians were simply convinced that they were united with Christ. Especially Paul, with his generous use of the phrases 'in Christ', 'through Christ', and 'with Christ', shows that the idea of unity between Christ and those who belong to him was an all-pervasive ferment in his thought.

---

[1] H.J. de Jonge, 'Setting', p. 231; C. Breytenbach, *Versöhnung*, pp. 198-199; R. Bieringer, 'Ursprung', pp. 223.

XIII. THE ORIGIN OF THE IDEA OF THE ESCHATOLOGICAL RESURRECTION AS A PARTICIPATION IN JESUS' RESURRECTION

(1) Paul viewed the future resurrection of those who are in Christ as something which would come about through the participation of the Christians in the resurrection of Christ. In the previous chapter it was shown that the presupposition of this concept of participation is the belief in the unity of Christ and the Christians. The belief that Christ and the Christians are one can indeed explain to a great extent how Paul could come to see Jesus' resurrection as an event in which all Christians will share. In fact, if Christ has risen and the Christians are one with him, then the Christians will have to rise as well.

The question remains to be asked, however, how Paul came at all to extend the notion of the unity between Christ and the Christians to include Jesus' resurrection and that of his followers.

The answer to this question should neither be sought in the character of the resurrection attributed to Jesus nor in the tradition from which this belief stems. Unlike his death, Jesus' resurrection was not originally conceived as a vicarious event. The idea that Jesus has died for all and thus all have died (2 Cor. 5:14) has its roots in the tradition of the martyr whose death was subsequently interpreted as salutary for others and as an impulse of the atonement.[1] However, the martyrological tradition does not comprise the idea that the martyr's resurrection is a representative event in which others will participate. The resurrection of the martyr is seen as a vindication, a personal reward for his loyalty to God and his willingness to die for God's cause. Paul's idea that Christians will participate in Jesus' resurrection cannot be explained, therefore, as a consequence of the tradition concerning the (martyrological) resurrection.[2]

Nor should the answer be sought in the character of the expected eschatological resurrection or the tradition from which the idea of the future resurrection stems. Nowhere in Jewish literature is the eschatological resurrection conceived as a participation in a previous resurrection, whether martyrological or of another type.

---

[1] See chapter XII, pp. 181-182.

[2] *Pace*, for instance, R.J. Tannehill, *Dying and Rising*, pp. 123-126 and P. Siber, *Mit Christus leben*, p. 96; see the section on the history of earlier research, pp. 17-19.

Two passages in Jewish literature might seem at first sight to offer analogies to Paul's idea, namely, 1 Enoch 49:3 and 2 Apoc. Bar. 30:1. In 1 Enoch the eschatological agent, called the Elect One, is said to have 'the spirit of those who sleep in righteousness.' The possession of this spirit does not signify, however, that there is a unity between the righteous ones who have passed away and the eschatological agent, in the sense that the eschatological agent represents them. Rather, the passage means to say that the eschatological agent will have the same spirit of righteousness as the righteous ones had in former times. Compare, for instance, the reference in the same verse (49:3) to the Elect One's possession of the spirit of wisdom, understanding, knowledge, and power.[1] In 2 Apoc. Bar. 30:1 it is said that, after the return of the eschatological agent to heaven, 'all who sleep in hope of him (i.e., the eschatological agent) will rise.' This passage does not intend to convey the idea that there is a unity between the righteous ones and the eschatological agent which might occasion the eschatological resurrection of the righteous ones. The author only intends to say that those righteous ones who will not live to experience the coming of the eschatological agent and the ensuing time of joy, but who did have the hope to witness that time, will eventually be rewarded in that they will be raised.

The conclusion has to remain that neither the belief in Jesus' own resurrection nor the concept of the eschatological resurrection can have occasioned Paul to extend the idea of the unity between the Christians and Christ so that the risen Christ became the representative of the Christians and the one in whose resurrection the Christians would share.

(2) Only Paul's view of the person of Jesus can explain why he extended the notion of the unity between Christ and the Christians to include their resurrection. Since Jesus was seen as the representative of a group—that is, as a person who, like Adam and Abraham, represented many people—his resurrection could also come to be seen as a representative event.

This process may have been stimulated by another development. As was previously set out in chapter IX, Jesus' followers already viewed him as an eschatological figure. As a result, his resurrection also came to be viewed as an eschatological event. This view on Jesus' resurrection may have been an extra stimulus for Paul to see the resurrection

---

[1] S. Mowinckel, *He that Cometh*, p. 377; J. Theisohn, *Richter*, p. 59, note 20.

of Jesus as a representative event in which all Christians would participate.

(3) The answer to the question why Jesus' resurrection came to be valued as representative of the future fate of the Christians or, what is the same, why the eschatological resurrection came to be conceived as a participation in the resurrection of Jesus, can be summarized as follows. Since Jesus' followers regarded him as the representative of their group, they also perceived his resurrection as representative of the fate they expected to experience in the future. In this view the resurrection of Jesus became the prototype of the eschatological resurrection, and the eschatological resurrection came to be seen as a participation in the resurrection of Jesus.

As far as can now be seen, it was Paul himself who developed this view. The reason why he developed this idea, is that it was useful in the context of his efforts to convince the Corinthians that, given Jesus' resurrection, the eschatological resurrection was bound to take place as well.

XIV. PAULINE THEMES RELATED TO THE IDEA THAT THE ESCHATOLOGICAL RESURRECTION WILL BE A PARTICIPATION IN JESUS' RESURRECTION

Two themes in Paul's letters are closely related to the idea that the eschatological resurrection will take place through participation in Jesus' resurrection. First, there is the theme of 'dying and rising with Christ'. According to Paul a Christian (already) participates in Jesus' death and resurrection from the moment he or she becomes a Christian. Moreover, the afflictions which a Christian experiences during his or her life can also be considered to be a participation in Jesus' suffering and death (e.g., 2 Cor. 3:1-7). The theme of 'dying and rising with Christ' will be the subject of section a. A second related theme is the idea of the association with Christ at the end of time. After Jesus' coming from heaven, all Christians will be 'with Christ' for ever (e.g., 1 Thess. 4:17). This theme will be examined in section b.

a. *Dying and rising with Christ*

(1) In chapter XI it was argued that, according to Paul in Rom. 6:4, a Christian has died and been made alive again with Christ. This participation in Jesus' resurrection is different in character from the one which will take place at the end of time. The way Rom. 6:4 speaks of participation in Jesus' (death and) resurrection is meant to be metaphorical. It is something which happens when a person becomes a Christian and is symbolized by his or her baptism. The language used there can be called metaphorical since the person receiving baptism does not physically die and rise. Those who will rise at the end of time, however, will have died physically and will be raised physically. Their participation in Jesus' resurrection is therefore physical reality. The term resurrection is not a metaphor in that case.

Paul speaks about man's dying and rising with Christ in a metaphorical sense in many other passages, in various ways, and for different reasons.[1] These passages can be categorized into two groups:

---

[1] For 'dying and rising' Paul does not always use the same terms. He speaks sometimes about *dying and living* with Christ, occasionally about *dying and rising* with Christ, and at other times about *being crucified and living* with Christ. Whatever the precise lan-

(a) those about dying and rising with Christ as a process of changing dominions; (b) those about dying and rising with Christ in suffering.[1]

(2) One way in which Paul speaks metaphorically about the participation of Christians in Jesus' death and resurrection focuses upon the conversion of a person to the Christian faith: by becoming a Christian, one changes dominions. A Christian is not under the dominion of sin anymore, but has died with Christ to sin and is now under the dominion of grace. He or she walks in newness of life in accordance with Jesus' resurrection. This participation in Jesus' death and resurrection is something which occurs only once in a Christian's life; namely, when he or she becomes a Christian. As mentioned above, this idea is found in Rom. 6:1-14.[2]

In 2 Cor. 5:14-15 Paul speaks about participation in Jesus' death as the true significance of Jesus' death for others: 'One has died for all; therefore all have died.' As a result, Christians do not live for themselves, but 'for him who died and was raised for them.' Just as in Rom. 6:1-14, Paul uses here the theme of participation in Jesus' death to make it clear that by becoming a Christian one changes lordship. A Christian has died with Christ and now lives for Christ, which means that he already lives the life of the new aeon (v. 17).

The idea that one changes lords at the moment of becoming a Christian is also found in Rom. 7:4, and again it is expressed in terms of dying and rising with Christ. In Rom. 7:4 Paul explains that through their death with Christ Christians have died to the law, which is part of the old aeon: 'You have died to the law through the body of Christ.' As a result Christians belong to a new master, namely, to Christ, the one 'who has been raised from the dead' (v. 4).

The same idea occurs in Gal. 2:19, but there the 'dying with Christ' is specified as 'being crucified with Christ.' Paul declares: 'I died to the law ... I have been crucified with Christ.' The result is that it is no longer Paul himself who lives, but Christ who lives in him (v. 20). Again, the idea presented here is that by becoming a Christian a person changes lords. Paul presents this change as a dying with Christ and a coming to life with him again.

---

guage he uses, the archetypical events are Jesus' death and resurrection. For this reason and for the sake of continuity with previous research on the subject, it is best to designate the theme as *dying and rising* with Christ.

[1] See R.C. Tannehill, *Dying and Rising, passim*; cf. the section on the history of earlier research, pp. 18-19.

[2] See chapter XI, pp. 169-171.

Paul speaks about being crucified with Christ in two other passages in Galatians: 5:24 and 6:14. Here being crucified means being dead or immune to passions and desires. Passions and desires are part of the fleshly realm, the old aeon. A Christian, then, is no longer under the dominion of this aeon, but under the dominion of Christ. In Gal. 5:24 Paul writes: 'Those who belong to Christ Jesus have crucified the flesh with its passions and desires.'[1] And about himself Paul states: 'The world has been crucified to me, and I to the world' (Gal. 6:14).

In short, Paul brings the notion of changing dominions, of passing from the old to the new aeon, from sin to grace, from death to life or from living for oneself to living for Jesus, to expression in terms of dying with Christ and being made alive again with Christ. The language used for designating this participation in Jesus' death and resurrection must be regarded as metaphorical.

(3) The other metaphorical way in which Paul speaks about participation in Jesus' death and resurrection bears upon a Christian's afflictions and subsequent recovery. This form of participation in Jesus' fate can happen to someone more than once, even daily, each time one suffers because of and for the sake of the gospel.

In the opening words of 2 Corinthians Paul mentions the suffering which he undergoes for the sake of the gospel (2 Cor. 1:3-7). He labels his hardships 'Christ's sufferings' (τὰ παθήματα τοῦ Χριστοῦ) and the consolation he received 'consolation through Christ'. Later in the letter, Paul speaks about one specific burden which does not leave him despite his prayers (12:7-10). The apostle calls it his 'weakness' (ἀσθένεια). It is a weakness, however, in which he has learned to boast since through this weakness the power of Christ becomes manifest in him (12:9). By stating that it is Christ who works through his weakness, Paul indirectly identifies his weakness and struggle with the weakness and suffering of Christ.[2]

Paul speaks about his weakness as an apostle also in 2 Cor. 13:4. He is referring here to his unconvincing performance before the Corinthians which was a reason for them to criticize his apostleship. Paul defends himself by stating that, just as Jesus was crucified in weakness (ἀσθένεια), he himself was weak 'in Christ' and, just as Jesus lives by the power of God, he himself will live with Jesus (ζήσομεν σὺν αὐτῷ,

---

[1] See also Rom. 8:13: 'For if you live according to the flesh, you will die; but if by the Spirit you put to death the deeds of the body, you will live.'

[2] For the idea, see also Col. 1:24.

i.e., Ἰησοῦ) by the power of God, when visiting the Corinthians again. The phrase εἰς ὑμᾶς (ἀλλὰ ζήσομεν σὺν αὐτῷ ἐκ δυνάμεως θεοῦ εἰς ὑμᾶς) refers to Paul's planned visit to the Corinthians as announced in verses 13:1 and 12:14.[1] It does not refer, as some have suggested, to the eschatological life in association with Jesus which Christians will receive when they will be raised (e.g., 1 Thess. 4:17).[2] Paul is representing here his temporary weakness and expected recovery as a participation in the weakness and recovery of the dying and rising Jesus. Paul uses σύν language here to associate his life as an apostle with the death and resurrection of Jesus.[3]

Paul also uses this σύν language in 2 Cor. 4:14. In 2 Cor. 4:7-15 he designates the afflictions of an apostle as the death of Jesus which the apostle has to carry in his body. The opposite, the participation in Jesus' resurrection life, seems to be apparent only among the Corinthians (vv. 10-12). Nevertheless, Paul will continue doing the things he does,[4] knowing that 'the one who raised the Lord Jesus will raise us (i.e., Paul and his fellow apostles) with Jesus, and will bring us with you (i.e., the Corinthians)' (v. 14). The resurrection mentioned in this verse is not the eschatological event. Paul is speaking here of the resurrection metaphorically. His language is the continuation of his metaphorical language about carrying the death of Jesus. The resurrection he refers to will be realized when he will visit the Corinthians with God's help (ἡμᾶς παραστήσει σὺν ὑμῖν).[5]

Many scholars contest the view that Paul in verse 14 speaks about resurrection in a metaphorical sense. They argue that the verb ἐγείρειν, when used in particular in conjunction with the phrase σὺν Ἰησοῦ (καὶ ἡμᾶς σὺν Ἰησοῦ ἐγερεῖ), is never employed by Paul metaphorically, but always in reference to the eschatological resurrection.[6] Furthermore, these scholars, by basing their reasoning upon 2 Cor. 11:2,

---

[1] See P. Siber, *Mit Christus leben*, p. 232; J. Murphy-O'Connor, *The Theology of the Second Letter to the Corinthians* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), p. 137.

[2] Cf. H. Windisch, *Korintherbrief*, p. 419.

[3] According to Siber, this use of σύν language in reference, not to a future eschatological life or resurrection with Jesus, but to a present life or resurrection with Jesus, is only found here (2 Cor. 13:4) in Paul's letters; P. Siber, *Mit Christus leben*, pp. 168-177. See, however, 2 Cor. 4:14 to be discussed below.

[4] The quotation of Ps 115:1(LXX) in verse 13, 'I believed, and so I spoke.' is meant to illustrate the inevitability of Paul's acting the way he does; namely, his preaching the gospel despite all the difficulties he encounters.

[5] See J. Murphy-O'Connor, 'Faith and Resurrection in 2 Cor. 4:13-14', *RB* 95 (1988), pp. 543-550; J. Murphy-O'Connor, *Theology*, p. 48.

[6] P. Siber, *Mit Christus leben*, p. 72.

maintain that the phrase παραστήσει σὺν ὑμῖν relates to the eschatological reunion of Paul and the Corinthians in the new aeon, either before or after the judgement.[1] These arguments are not sufficient to warrant the view that in 2 Cor. 4:14 Paul is referring to the eschatological resurrection. It is more likely, for several reasons, that this passage is concerned with some form of reviving of the apostle during his ministry in this world.

First of all, Paul has in mind only his own resurrection and that of his companions (other apostles), not that of the Corinthians or all Christians. The pronoun ἡμᾶς in καὶ ἡμᾶς σὺν Ἰησοῦ ἐγερεῖ cannot include the Corinthians, for they are referred to separately in the following καὶ παραστήσει σὺν ὑμῖν. By contrasting 'we' (that is, Paul and his companions who will rise) with 'you' (the Corinthians, whom Paul and his companions will meet after their 'resurrection'), Paul continues on the line of thought started in verses 10-12. There he contends that he and his fellow apostles carry the death of Jesus, whereas the Corinthians share in Jesus' resurrection life. Accordingly, Paul now states that he and the other apostles will be 'raised', in a metaphorical sense of the word, to meet the Corinthians. This will come about for their sake (τὰ γὰρ πάντα δι' ὑμᾶς, v. 15). It would not make sense to state that the *eschatological* resurrection of Paul and his fellow apostles will happen for the sake of the Corinthians. Only when the resurrection of Paul is connected to his intended visit to the Corinthians can his resurrection be regarded as something which will take place for their sake (v. 15).

A second argument, related to the previous one, concerns the metaphorical use of resurrection language in verse 14. This corresponds perfectly with the metaphorical (death and) resurrection language used in verses 10-12. Only if Paul's remarks on his resurrection in verse 14 are taken as metaphorical, is there a coherent line of thought from verse 7 through verse 15.[2]

Thirdly, Paul says that he 'knows' (εἰδότες) that he will be raised. Now if he is referring here to the eschatological resurrection, his use of the verb 'to know' would imply that he expected with full confidence that he (and other apostles) would die before Jesus' return. But this inference finds no confirmation in other passages in Paul. Else-

---

[1] R.P. Martin, *2 Corinthians*, p. 90; H. Windisch, *Korintherbrief*, p. 150; R. Bultmann, *Korinther*, p. 124.

[2] If verse 14 is seen as referring to the eschatological resurrection, verse 14 and the surrounding verses are conspicuously less coherent.

where, the apostle seems to expect that he will stay alive until Jesus' return.[1] Considering the fact that Paul expected to live to see Jesus' second coming, it is highly improbable that he meant to say in 2 Cor. 4:14 that he and other disciples would die before Jesus' appearance, while the Corinthians would live to see the day of Jesus' coming. Since, in the preceding context, Paul speaks of himself metaphorically as carrying Jesus' death in his body, it is quite natural to suppose that when speaking now of his resurrection, he is expressing himself also metaphorically. He must be referring, therefore, to a 'spiritual' resurrection which he will experience when he will come to Corinth. The Corinthians are not included in this resurrection, however, for they already share the resurrection life of Christ.

Fourthly, the phrase παραστήσει σὺν ὑμῖν is a priori unlikely to allude to the (eschatological) reunion of Paul and the Corinthians in the new aeon due to the fact that, in noticeable contrast to other parallel passages, there is no reference to Jesus or God being present at the time when this 'resurrection' will take place.[2] The meaning of σύν in the phrase σὺν ὑμῖν concurs with the idea of παρά plus dative and πρός plus accusative, and can best be translated as 'in the company of': God will bring us in your company. One can compare Paul's use of the preposition σύν in the phrase in ὁ θεὸς τοὺς κοιμηθέντες ἄξει σὺν αὐτῷ (1 Thess. 4:14).[3]

Finally, Paul speaks metaphorically of his dying and reviving with Christ during his lifetime also in 2 Cor. 13:4 (see above). Here, too, Paul speaks about his visit to the Corinthians in terms of living again with Christ in contrast to a previous time of trouble and weakness which he presents as a participation in Jesus' death.

The conclusion must be, therefore, that in 2 Cor. 4:14 Paul does not speak about the eschatological resurrection. He speaks about resurrection here in a metaphorical way. He means that he will regain life when he will come to Corinth and visit the Christian community there. His visit to them will be as much as a restoration of life as that of the rising Jesus. This reviving will terminate his previous time of hardship which

---

[1] See, for instance, 1 Thess. 4:15-17; 1 Cor. 15:51-52; 2 Cor. 5:1-5. The only exceptions are Phil. 1:26 and 3:10; however, there Paul expresses the expectation that a possible violent death will result in a resurrection directly after his death, as in the case of martyrs; see chapter IX, pp. 153-154.

[2] See, for instance, 2 Cor. 11:2: παραστῆσαι τῷ θεῷ; cf. 1 Cor. 8:8; Rom. 14:10; and J. Murphy-O'Connor, *Faith*, p. 549.

[3] Cf. the use of the preposition σύν in 1 Thess. 4:17; 5:10; and Luke 9:32. For παριστάναι as describing a meeting between persons face to face, see Acts 1:3; 9:41; 23:24.

he considers to be a participation in Jesus' suffering and death. 2 Cor. 4:14 agrees with 2 Cor. 1:3-7, 12:7-10, and 13:4: the suffering of a Christian, the anguish of an apostle in particular, is described metaphorically as a participation in Jesus' sufferings. Consequently, the recovery of a Christian or apostle is seen as a participation in Jesus' recovery, that is, his resurrection.

(4) The origin of the metaphorical way of speaking about participation in Jesus' death and resurrection, whether this is something happening only once or as a continuous experience in one's own suffering and recovery, has been the subject of a long and heated debate.[1] Many have argued that its origin should be sought in the mystery religions. A.J.M. Wedderburn, however, has refuted this view by pointing out, *inter alia*, that Paul's idea that someone has been 'with Christ' in the latter's death and resurrection *in the past* distinguishes the apostle's conceptions sharply from those found in the mystery religions.[2] Wedderburn argues that the idea of being united with Jesus' death and resurrection as events of the past is part of the more general Christian conviction that there is a unity between Jesus and his followers. Jesus' followers felt united with Jesus in such a way that they also could consider themselves as having been with Jesus in his death and resurrection. As argued in chapter XII, this belief should be seen as the early Christian equivalent and continuation of the traditional, Jewish belief in the unity of, and solidarity between, a group of people and its leader or representative.

In chapter XII it was also demonstrated that the belief in the unity of a group of people and their representative is the foundation of the idea that Jesus' vicarious death had brought about reconciliation between God and man. This throws light on the origin of the image of participation in Jesus' *death*: it is a natural deduction from the idea that Jesus' death was a vicarious event. Jesus had died for all and thus all have died, Paul concludes (2 Cor. 5:14). He then interprets this death of all as a death to those things to which a Christian should not be attached: sin, flesh, passion, law.

However, the idea that someone can also participate in Jesus' *resurrection* is rather remarkable. As explained in the previous chapter, the reason why Paul can interpret Jesus' resurrection as an event in which Christians participate is that, in his view, Jesus was the representative

---

[1] See the section on the history of earlier research on this subject, pp. 15-22.

[2] See the section on the history of earlier research, pp. 20-21.

of his followers. Jesus' resurrection came to be seen as a representative event because Jesus was viewed as a representative figure.[1] In this way Paul is not only able to designate the Christians' resurrection at the end of time as a participation in Jesus' resurrection, but he can also speak about another kind of participation in Jesus' resurrection, namely, the Christians' revivification from weakness of any sort in this life. Whenever Paul calls such a reviving 'resurrection', his language is metaphorical. Paul's metaphorical use of resurrection language in this sense is to be understood as an expansion of his metaphorical use of 'dying with Christ' language. Since Paul could say that Christians die with Christ and that Christ's death had brought about life for them, he could also say that Christians in this life can rise with Christ. Paul's metaphorical use of resurrection language for the recovery of Christians from any kind of weakness is just an extension of his metaphorical 'dying with Christ' language.

Metaphorical use of 'rising with Christ' language is relatively rare in Paul. The reason for this is probably because the resurrection of Jesus was not originally conceived as a saving event. To designate the recovery or reviving of Christians in this life, Paul often makes a metaphorical use of terms for 'living'. He speaks, for instance, about 'walking in newness of life' (Rom. 6:4), or living 'for' Christ (2 Cor. 5:15; Rom 7:4), or living 'with' Christ (2 Cor. 13:4). Only once does he speak about being raised with Christ (2 Cor. 4:14). By analogy with his metaphorical use of 'dying with Christ', Paul here uses the phrase 'living with Christ' metaphorically.

(5) The idea that one's conversion or one's suffering and recovery is a participation in Jesus' death and resurrection, as well as the idea that the eschatological resurrection is a participation in Jesus' resurrection, proves to be based on the concept of the Christians' unity with Christ. This raises the question whether the former, metaphorical use of the topic 'resurrection' exerted any influence on the rise of the latter concept of the eschatological participation in Jesus' resurrection. Did Paul form the idea of the eschatological resurrection as a participation in Jesus' resurrection around the model of the idea that one's conversion to Christianity, or a Christian's recovery from weakness, can be conceived as a participation in the fate of Jesus?[2] It is of course impossible

[1] See chapter XIII, pp. 186-187.

[2] This view has been defended by several scholars; see the section on the history of research, pp. 16-17.

to establish with any certainty whether or not Paul developed either of the two ideas, which are closely related anyhow, independently from the other. Yet, there seems to be enough reason to justify the view that Paul's designation of the reviving of a Christian in this life after a time of weakness, or his conversion, as a 'rising with Christ' has not influenced his idea that the eschatological resurrection will be a participation in Jesus' resurrection.

Both ideas are used by Paul independently of the other. In 1 Cor. 15:20-22 and Rom. 8:11 there are no indications that his ideas concerning the eschatological participation in Jesus' resurrection have been influenced by his view that a Christian's recovery after misery, or his conversion, is a participation in Jesus' resurrection. In 1 Cor. 15:20-22 the idea that Christians will be raised through participation in Jesus' resurrection is based on three notions: (a) Jesus has been raised as the representative (ἀπαρχή) of all others who will be raised (v. 20); (b) just as Adam was the first person in whose death all people participate, Christ was the first one raised and, consequently, the one in whose resurrection all Christians will participate (vv. 21-22); and (c) 'those of Christ' will follow the one who was raised since he was the first one to be raised (v. 23).[1] None of these notions shows a trace of the idea that people have already died and risen with Christ when they became Christians. The eschatological participation in Jesus' resurrection is not presented as an extension of a previous participation in Jesus' death and resurrection at the moment of either one's conversion or one's recovery from any form of weakness. Nor is the latter idea of importance for understanding the former.

In Rom. 8:11 the eschatological resurrection through participation in Jesus' resurrection is thought of as the final result of the Christians' unity with Christ. The Spirit which dwelt in Jesus and raised him will also raise those in whom the Spirit is dwelling now. The way Paul conceives the eschatological resurrection here as a participation in Jesus' resurrection betrays no influence whatsoever from the apostle's metaphorical use of resurrection language, either for one's conversion or for one's recovery from tribulation.

The only passage in which the two types of participation in Jesus' resurrection are linked, is Rom. 6:4-5. There the idea surfaces that, because people have participated in Jesus' death and resurrection in this life, namely, in baptism (v. 4), they will also participate in Jesus' resurrection in the future, at the end of time when the eschatological res-

---

[1] See chapter II, pp. 55-57.

urrection will take place (v. 5). But in 1 Cor. 15:20-22, Paul does not allude to any link between a participation in Jesus' resurrection in the past and that in the future. It is legitimate, therefore, to assume that Paul formed the idea that the eschatological resurrection will be a participation in Jesus' resurrection, on the one hand, and the idea that one's suffering and recovery, or one's conversion, or baptism, is a participation in Jesus' death and resurrection, on the other, independently.

Both ideas, that of the eschatological participation in Jesus' resurrection and that of conversion, baptism, or suffering and recovery, as a participation in Jesus' fate, should be seen as mutually independent deductions from the concept of the Christians' unity with Christ. This view finds support in the fact that the concept of the Christians' unity with Christ was the matrix of several other Pauline ideas. The idea, for example, that the Christians together form one body (σῶμα), more specifically, the body of Christ (1 Cor. 12:12), is nothing but a specification of the concept of the Christians' unity with Christ, brought to expression with the help of a common Hellenistic metaphor.[1] Because all Christians are united with Christ, they all form a body. Paul can also say that they were 'baptized into one body' (1 Cor. 12:13). As a result, Christians should live in harmony with one another and respect each other as equals. In another passage, 1 Cor. 6:15, Paul argues that, because each Christian is a member (μέλος) of the body of Christ, he should refrain from fornication. Referring to Gen. 2:24 he explains that 'whoever is united to a prostitute becomes one body with her' (1 Cor. 6:16). But because a Christian is already one body with Christ, that is, lives in unity with Christ, he must not unite with a prostitute, for that would annihilate his unity with Christ. Paul thus draws up a guideline for morally correct behaviour starting from the conviction that Christians are united with Christ.

From his basic conviction that Christians are united with Christ, Paul evolves various new ideas. One may infer from this that his idea that the eschatological resurrection will be a participation in Jesus' resurrection also is a variation of the same basic conviction. It is unnecessary to assume that Paul formed his idea that the eschatological resurrection is a participation in Jesus' resurrection on the analogy of his notion that a Christian's recovery from a setback, or someone's conversion to Christianity, or his baptism, can be interpreted as a participation in the fate of Jesus.

---

[1] See the commentaries *ad locum*; E. Best, *Body*, pp. 83-95.

(6) Paul's phrase 'dying and rising with Christ' is a metaphor. It stands for one of two notions. Either it denotes a Christian's suffering in consequence of his faith and his ensuing spiritual recovery, or it refers to someone's conversion to Christianity, or baptism. This metaphorical usage should be distinguished from Paul's 'rising with Christ' language in relation to the eschatological resurrection. Both the metaphor and the eschatological 'rising with Christ' language, however, are expressions of the tradition according to which the Christian believers and Christ form a unity. This tradition is the early Christian continuation of the Jewish tradition concerning the unity formed by all those belonging to God's people. It is thus the Christian continuation of the widespread ancient tradition according to which a group of people and their leader or representative constitute a unity. The eschatological 'rising with Christ' language is not directly dependent on the metaphor of 'dying and rising with Christ'.

b. *The eschatological association with Christ*

(1) Paul holds that after Jesus' second coming Christians will live in eternal association with Christ; see, for instance, 1 Thess. 4:17. This is another idea closely related to his belief that the eschatological resurrection will take place through participation in Jesus' resurrection. The idea of 'being with Christ' after his coming in glory and the notion of 'being raised with Christ' at his coming seem to be closely related, at least as far as their content is concerned. The question has to be asked, therefore, whether they are related traditio-historically.

According to 1 Thess. 4:14-17, Paul expects that when Christ comes, all his followers will be gathered in order to meet the Lord in the air. Then they will be with the Lord forever (καὶ οὕτως πάντοτε σὺν κυρίῳ ἐσόμεθα).[1] As was argued above, Rom. 6:8 reflects the same tradition: Christians will live with him (συζήσομεν αὐτῷ). Reference may also be made to 2 Cor. 5:8, but there Paul uses different language. He speaks about 'moving in with the Lord' (ἐνδημῆσαι πρὸς τὸν κύριον). This will lead to the eternal life which each Christian will obtain. This eternal life contrasts sharply with man's life in the body on earth, with all its imperfection. Paul speaks about the eternal association with Christ also in Phil. 1:23. In this case he has in mind his own association with Christ. He expects to be associated with the Lord

[1] Cf. 1 Thess. 5:10.

in the event that he might die a violent death. Paul's idea of his own afterlife here is that of a martyrological resurrection taking place immediately after his death.[1] But the result is the same as that of the eschatological resurrection: living in community with the Lord.

(2) It is generally agreed that the idea of the eschatological association or communion with God's definitive envoy stems from Judaism.[2] The expectation that righteous ones will dwell with God's eschatological agent (and/or with God) comes to expression in several passages in Jewish literature, for instance, in 1 Enoch 62:14: 'And with that Son of Man they will dwell, and eat, and lie down, and rise up for ever and ever.'[3] The idea of the eschatological association with the eschatological agent and/or God has analogies in the views of pagan authors of the Hellenistic and earlier periods. Several of them held that after someone's death the soul left the earthly realm, ascended to heaven, and dwelled in the realm of the divinity. This pagan psychology has some ground in common with the Jewish and Christian expectation that the righteous ones would eventually live in the company of God's special agent and/or God himself.[4]

It is a debated question whether in Paul the phrase σὺν Χριστῷ εἶναι, especially the use of σύν in reference to the eschatological relationship between Jesus and his followers (both as an independent preposition and as a prefix in certain compounds, such as συζῆν in, for instance, συζήσομεν αὐτῷ, Rom. 6:8), is a specific, technical phrase to designate the idea of the eschatological association.[5] If the answer is in the affirmative, the phrase σὺν Χριστῷ εἶναι would be Paul's *own* formulaic expression for the idea in question since other Jewish authors of the time use different expressions to designate the eschatological community of God's people and his agent.[6] There is not enough reason, however, to answer the question affirmatively.

Firstly, when Paul speaks about the eschatological association of Christ and the Christians, he designates their being together not only

---

[1] See chapter IX, pp. 153-155.

[2] E. Lohmeyer, 'ΣΥΝ ΧΡΙΣΤΩΙ', in: *Festgabe für A. Deissmann* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1927), pp. 218-257; J. Dupont, *L'union, passim*; P. Siber, *Mit Christus leben*, p. 253.

[3] See also Zeph. 3:15-17; Zech. 9:8-10; Jub. 1:17, 26, 28; 1 Enoch 71:16-17; 105:2; 4 Ezra 7:28.

[4] W. Grundmann, 'σύν-μετά mit Genitiv', in: *ThWNT*, vol. VII (1964), pp. 772-773; J. Dupont, *L'union*, pp. 190-191; P. Hoffmann, *Toten*, p. 302.

[5] So, for instance, in 1 Thess. 4:17; 5:10; Phil. 1:23; Rom. 6:8.

[6] J. Dupont, *L'union*, p. 190.

by the phrase σὺν Χριστῷ εἶναι, or by σύν, or by compounds with συ(ν)-, but also by other turns of phrase. See, for instance, 2 Cor. 5:8: εὐδοκοῦμεν μᾶλλον ... ἐνδημῆσαι πρὸς τὸν κύριον.

Secondly, phrases with the preposition σύν or its compounds are also used by Paul to express other forms of relationship between Jesus and his followers than only their eschatological association. Compounds with συ(ν)- in Paul can also denote, for instance, someone's participation in Jesus' death and resurrection at the moment of his or her conversion or baptism. See Rom. 6:4: συνέταφημεν, 'we are buried with Christ.'[1] Moreover, as has been argued above, the metaphorical use of 'rising with Christ' language is only one expression of the ancient, widespread tradition according to which Christ and the Christians are one. Paul puts this tradition also into words in such phrases as 'in Christ' (ἐν Χριστῷ) or 'through Christ' (διὰ Χριστοῦ). In other words, Paul uses the preposition σύν in reference to various types of relationship between Jesus and his followers and not exclusively to their eschatological association with Christ.

(3) The question should be asked whether the idea of the eschatological association with Christ has in any way influenced Paul's idea that the eschatological resurrection will take place through participation in Jesus' resurrection. Is Paul's idea that Christians will be raised with Christ at the end of time perhaps an extension of the idea that Christians will join Christ at his parousia?[2] It should be observed once again that it is very difficult to establish with certainty whether or not two ideas which are closely related as to their contents originated independently. Yet, there seem to be at least two reasons to assume that, traditio-historically, these two ideas developed independently.

Firstly, in two passages in which Paul speaks about the eschatological resurrection as a participation in Jesus' resurrection, 1 Cor. 15:20-22 and Rom. 8:11, he does not connect this theme with the idea of the Christians' association with Christ.[3] In 1 Thess. 4:13-18 their associa-

---

[1] Compare also 2 Cor. 4:14, σὺν Ἰησοῦ ἐγερεῖ; 2 Cor. 13:4, ζήσομεν σὺν αὐτῷ; Rom. 6:6 συνεσταυρώθη; Rom. 6:8, ἀπεθάνομεν σὺν Χριστῷ; Gal. 2:19, Χριστῷ συνεσταύρωμαι; cf. J.D.G. Dunn, *Romans*, p. 321; O. Kuss, *Römerbrief*, pp. 319-326.

[2] Several scholars have indeed argued in favour of this view; see the section on the history of earlier research, pp. 16-17.

[3] In 1 Cor. 15:28 Paul states that after the last events God will be 'all in all'. This assertion must allude to the eschatological association of God, Jesus, and all the righteous ones. However, the idea of this future association does not presuppose the idea of the eschatological resurrection with Christ, but that of Christ's destruction of all powers and his handing over of the kingdom to God. Traditio-historically speaking, the idea of be-

tion with Christ is viewed as the goal of the eschatological resurrection, but the eschatological resurrection is not presented as taking place through participation in the resurrection of Jesus.[1]

Only in Rom. 6:5-8 are the two ideas linked, but clearly secondarily. In verse 5 Paul contends that the eschatological resurrection of Christians with Christ is the result of their previous sharing in Jesus' death and resurrection. In verse 8 he rephrases this contention by claiming that, if someone has participated in Jesus' death and resurrection, he will also live with Christ for ever (συζήσομεν αὐτῷ). The eschatological association with Jesus (v. 8) is presented as the result, not of the eschatological resurrection with Christ, but of the participation of the faithful in Jesus' death and resurrection at the moment of their conversion and baptism (v. 4). Verses 5 and 8, of course, should be taken to be of the same purport. There must be some link, therefore, between the notion of rising with Christ and the idea of living eternally with Christ. Rising with Christ and living eternally with Christ are two sides of the same coin. They are both the consequence of a Christian's previous community with Christ. Nevertheless, the relationship between the idea of the eschatological association with Christ, on the one hand, and that of the eschatological participation in Jesus' resurrection, on the other, is not such as to allow one to conclude that the latter developed as an extension of the former.

Secondly, and more importantly, while the two ideas in question may *prima facie* resemble each other, nonetheless, they stem from different traditions. The idea that the eschatological resurrection will take place through participation in Jesus' resurrection evolved out of the tradition according to which Christians are united with Christ. In this tradition the notion of representation plays an essential role. Jesus is the representative of the Christians and they may consider themselves as united with Christ. This notion of representation plays no role in the idea that Christians will live in association with Christ, nor in the tradition from which it stems. The association of the faithful with the eschatological agent (and/or God) at the end of time is simply a real community.

---

ing with Christ after Jesus' coming, an idea not even explicitly expressed in this passage, is in no way related to that of being made alive with Christ.

[1] 1 Thess. 4:13-18 does, however, convey the notion that Christ and the Christians form a unity; see chapter XI, pp. 171-172.

(4) It can be concluded that the idea of the Christians' association with Christ at his second coming and the idea of the resurrection in and through Christ, developed independently. Both concern a form of unity between Christ and the Christians in the new era. But the way this unity comes about in each of the two ideas is different.[1] The tradition of the eschatological resurrection through participation in the resurrection of Christ cannot have evolved, therefore, out of the tradition according to which the Christians will eventually live in close association with Christ.

[1] This difference prevents one also from arguing that Paul's use of 'dying and rising with Christ' language for conversion, baptism, or recovery from distress, evolved out of the tradition concerning the eschatological association with Christ. This has nevertheless been argued by several scholars. They adduce as an argument *inter alia* that Paul uses in both cases the preposition σύν and/or verbs with the prefix συ(ν)- (thus, for instance, E. Schweizer, 'Mystik', pp. 190-194; see also the section on the history of earlier research, pp. 16-17). They conclude that the σύν language concerning the eschatological association of the Christians with Christ formed the traditio-historical basis from which two further traditions developed: (a) the use of 'dying and rising with Christ' language for conversion, baptism, and recovery from distress, and (b) the eschatological participation in the resurrection of Christ. This reconstruction, however, exaggerates the significance of Paul's use of σύν in the passages concerned. It also neglects the difference in nature of the unity between Christ and the Christians in the traditions (a) and (b). The concept of unity underlying the idea of the participation in Jesus' death and resurrection is based on the idea that Jesus is the representative of the Christians (cf. J.D.G. Dunn, *Romans*, p. 321). The concept of unity in the idea of the eschatological association of Christ and the Christians is a form of real community.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

(1) In 1 Corinthians 15 Paul addresses those Corinthians who rejected a resurrection at the end of time. In his reply Jesus' resurrection and future coming play a crucial role. With the help of these two notions Paul develops three ideas in order to convince the Corinthians of the future reality of the eschatological resurrection: (a) Jesus' resurrection is the beginning of the eschatological resurrection; (b) the eschatological resurrection will take place through participation in Jesus' resurrection; (c) the eschatological resurrection will take place at the time of Jesus' coming in glory.

(2) At first sight the idea that the eschatological resurrection will take place when Jesus will appear in glory seems to be a natural combination of two eschatological expectations, yet in Paul's letters it is found only twice (1 Cor. 15:23; 1 Thess. 4:16-17) and in the gospel of Mark or the source Q not at all. In the Pauline passages both expectations are connected in order to remedy misconceptions on the part of Paul's readers. In 1 Thess. 4:16-17 Paul relates the expectation of the resurrection in the future, about which the Thessalonians were still insufficiently informed, to the expectation of Jesus' coming in glory, already known to them. In 1 Cor. 15:23 Paul relates the expectation of the eschatological resurrection, rejected by his addressees, to their belief in the resurrection of Jesus. Although both the expectation of Jesus' coming in glory and that of the eschatological resurrection were already part of the Christian belief long before Paul wrote his letters, the connection of these expectations was made only by Paul.

Both expectations have their origin in Jewish traditions. The expectation of the eschatological resurrection was simply taken over from Judaism. Since the expectation of the eschatological resurrection is attested in the Christian sources Paul, Mark, and Q, on the one hand, and by several pre-Christian Jewish sources, on the other, it was probably also part of the belief of Jesus' followers in the time of his terrestrial activity.

The expectation of Jesus' coming at the end of time originated as the Christian version of the expectation of the coming Son of Man. The belief that Jesus would soon come in glory, arose soon after his death as a result of the Christians' perseverance in the belief in the immi-

nence of God's reign. After Jesus' death, his followers held on to Jesus' message that God's kingdom would soon break through. They also kept believing that at that breakthrough, Jesus would play a decisive role. To express this belief they used the apocalyptic tradition of the coming Son of Man, and identified the Son of Man with Jesus. The result was the belief that Jesus would come (return) at the end of time as God's definitive eschatological agent.

Since both expectations, namely, that of the eschatological resurrection and that of the coming of Jesus in glory, concern the events of the last day, it is not surprising that at one moment the two were associated. Nevertheless, Paul in 1 Thess. 4:16-17 and 1 Cor. 15:23 was the first to combine them explicitly. The reasons why Paul proceeded to the explicit combination of the two traditions were lying in the misunderstandings on the part of his Thessalonian and Corinthian readers.

The connection of both expectations can be seen as an early Christian step towards the systematic harmonization of originally independent traditions concerning the events of the end of time, i.e., towards one single eschatological scenario. Paul's systematisation is comparable to those propounded by his Jewish contemporaries (e.g., 2 Apoc. Bar. 30:1; 1 Enoch 51; 4 Ezra 7:26-44). These authors, too, telescope several eschatological expectations, including that of the eschatological resurrection and that of the coming of God's eschatological agent. The results were different but the process was similar to what was going on in Paul's literary activity.

(3) By calling the risen Jesus the 'first-fruits of those who have fallen asleep' (1 Cor. 15:20) Paul presents Jesus' resurrection as the beginning of the eschatological resurrection. In Paul's view, there is one resurrection in two stages, each with its own category of beneficiaries. As Paul explains in verse 23, Christ forms the one, the followers of Christ the other category.

This conception is not found elsewhere in Paul's letters. Elsewhere in early Christian literature only a few reminiscences of it occur, mainly in writings influenced by Paul (Col. 1:18; Acts 26:23; cf. Rev. 1:5). One may conclude, therefore, that Paul is most likely to have devised this idea himself. He had a good reason to produce this idea: it suited perfectly his reply to the Corinthian denial of the eschatological resurrection. The logical basis of Paul's reply is an alleged relationship between Jesus' resurrection and the eschatological resurrection: 'If there is no resurrection of the dead, then Christ has not been raised' (1 Cor. 15:13). The idea that Jesus' resurrection is the beginning of the

eschatological resurrection has to serve Paul's plea in defence of the future reality of the eschatological resurrection. If one believes, as the Corinthians do, according to Paul, that Jesus has been raised, then one must necessarily believe that there will be a resurrection at the end of time.

In the idea that Jesus' resurrection inaugurated the eschatological resurrection, two different traditions bearing upon resurrection are connected. Jesus' followers believed that Jesus had been raised into heaven, soon after his death, and individually. By contrast, the eschatological resurrection was believed to take place on earth, at the end of time, and those to be raised would rise collectively. Consequently, one must conclude that the two concepts stem from different traditions. The belief in Jesus' resurrection, on the one hand, is based on the tradition concerning the heavenly vindication of the martyr. This tradition comes clearly to light in 2 Maccabees 7. This chapter testifies to the belief that the martyrs who died in consequence of their dedication to the rules of the Jewish religion, were vindicated by God soon after their deaths in that he raised them and took them up into heaven where they received a new body. Both the language and the ideas in which this belief takes shape in 2 Maccabees, agree with the terminology and concepts in which the earliest traceable belief in the resurrection of Jesus expresses itself. The Jewish tradition in question is also attested by Wisdom of Solomon 2-5 and Pseudo-Philo, *Biblical Antiquities* 40:4. The Christian expectation of the eschatological resurrection, on the other hand, is the direct continuation of a Jewish eschatological tradition.

In 1 Corinthians 15 Paul telescopes the two types of resurrection. He is able to do so because he views Jesus as an eschatological figure. Since Jesus was God's eschatological agent, all his actions could be seen as events belonging to the end of time. This applied also to his death and resurrection. Jesus' death became part of an eschatological worldview and received eschatological significance. In accordance with Jewish *martyrological* tradition, his death was interpreted as an event which had brought about God's grace for those who had belonged to Jesus' group and remained faithful to him and his message after his death. But the saving effect of Jesus' death took much wider dimensions than that of other martyrs' deaths through the fact that, in addition, this death came to be interpreted as an *eschatological* event. Christians now came to believe that Jesus' death had established eternal and universal atonement. Similarly, Jesus' resurrection, at one moment interpreted as a martyrological resurrection, came also to be seen as

belonging to the events of the end of time. Consequently, Paul could claim it to be the beginning of the eschatological resurrection.

Paul's eschatological interpretation of Jesus' martyrological death has an analogy in As. Mos. 9-10. In this passage the martyrdom of Taxo and his sons are said to inaugurate the last events. The death of these martyrs triggers God's final intervention. Similarly to Paul, the author of the Assumption of Moses makes a martyrdom part of the eschatological scenario.

(4) Paul's claim that the risen Jesus is the 'first-fruits of those who have fallen asleep' (1 Cor. 15:20) also reflects Paul's idea that the eschatological resurrection will take place through participation in Jesus' resurrection. Jesus represents all those who are faithful to him. The latter will therefore join the risen Lord in that they will be raised with him. Jesus represents all those who will be raised just as Adam represents all who die. Those who are 'in Christ' will be raised as a result of their unity with Christ, the ones 'in Adam' will die because of their unity with Adam.

This interpretation of the eschatological resurrection as an organic and inevitable consequence of the resurrection of Jesus is another argument in Paul's plea in favour of the future reality of the eschatological resurrection. This view of the eschatological resurrection betrays the early Christian conviction that Christ and the Christians are closely connected. If one accepts that Jesus has been raised, and believes that Christians are united with Christ, then one can and must also believe that all Christians will be raised at the end of time. Paul extends the concept of the Christians' unity with Christ so that Christ and the Christians also become one in the resurrection. Parallels occur in Rom. 6:5 and 8:11.

The Christians' unity with Christ is a seminal theme in Paul' letters. It presents itself in various forms. It has its origin in the tradition, widespread in the ancient Near Eastern world, which assumes that there is solidarity and unity between a group of people and their leader, patriarch, or representative. The Christian version of this tradition comes to expression in two significant Pauline ideas. Firstly, there is Paul's idea that the unity of Christ and the Christians is comparable to that of Abraham and the nations, and to that of Adam and humankind. Just as all people die because Adam inaugurated death, all nations will share, through Christ, in the blessing God bestowed on Abraham. Secondly, there is the idea, which Paul borrowed from earlier Christian tradition, that the death of Jesus brought about reconcil-

iation between God and his people. This idea goes back to Jewish martyrological tradition. The ancient tradition according to which a group of people and their representative form a unity, however, is also the basis of this martyrological tradition concerning the atoning effect of a martyr's death.

The tradition concerning the solidarity between a group and its representative caused Paul to form two new ideas on the significance and function of Jesus' resurrection. (a) Since he viewed Jesus as the one who represented the Christians, he could take his resurrection as proleptic and a prototype of the resurrection of all Christians. (b) Since Paul viewed Jesus as God's eschatological envoy, he could take Jesus' martyrological resurrection to be eschatological in nature and, consequently, the eschatological resurrection of all Christians to be a participation in the resurrection of Jesus.

Two further Pauline ideas are closely related to the idea that the eschatological resurrection will occur through participation in Jesus' resurrection. First, his idea that one can 'die and rise with Christ' in this world, for instance, at the moment of one's conversion or baptism. This, too, is an elaboration of the tradition concerning the unity and solidarity between Christ and the Christians. The metaphorical use of 'dying and rising with Christ' language is not likely to have been the origin of the idea that the eschatological resurrection will be a participation in that of Jesus.

Second, Paul's idea that after Jesus' coming in glory and the resurrection, Jesus and the believers will dwell together. This idea derives from the Jewish tradition concerning the eschatological association of the righteous ones with God's eschatological agent (and/or God). For this reason it is most improbable that the Christian tradition concerning the eschatological association of Christ and the Christians contributed anything to the rise of Paul's idea that the eschatological resurrection will be a participation in that of Jesus.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

a. *Sources*

Old Testament, Masoretic Text

Elliger, K.; Rudolph, W. (eds.), *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1977).

Septuagint

Rahlfs, A. (ed.), *Septuaginta, id est Vetus Testamentum graece iuxta LXX interpretes* (Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1935).

New Testament

Nestle, E.; Aland, K. (eds.), *Novum Testamentum graece* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, ^{27}1993).

Latin Vulgate

Weber, R.; Fischer, B. (eds.), *Biblia Sacra iuxta vulgatam versionem* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, ^{3}1983).

Peshitta

Peshitta Institute Leiden, *The Old Testament in Syriac according to the Peshitta Version*, 17 vols. to date (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1966-).

Pseudepigrapha

Black, M.; Denis, A.-M. (eds.), *Apocalypsis Henochi graece, Fragmenta pseudepigraphorum quae supersunt graeca* (PVTG 3; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1970).

Brock, S.P.; Picard, J.-C. (eds.), *Testamentum Iobi, Apocalypsis Baruchi graece* (PVTG 2; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1967).

Dedering, S.; Bidawid, R.J. (eds.), *Apocalypsis Baruch, 4 Ezrae. The Old Testament in Syriac according to the Peshitta Version, part IV, fasc. 3* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1973).

Geffcken, J. (ed.), *Die Oracula Sibyllina* (Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1902).

Harrington, D.J. (ed.), *Pseudo-Philon. Les Antiquités bibliques* (SC 229; Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1976).

Horst, P.W. van der (ed.), *The Sentences of Pseudo-Phocylides* (SVTP 4; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1978).

Knibb, M.A. (ed., in consultation with E. Ullendorff), *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch. A New Edition in the Light of the Aramaic Dead Sea Fragments* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978).

Nagel, M. (ed.), *Vita Adae et Evae*, in: A.-M. Denis, *Concordance grecque des pseudépigraphes d'Ancien Testament* (Louvain-la-Neuve: Université Catholique de Louvain, 1987), pp. 815-818.

Tromp, J. (ed.), *The Assumption of Moses. A Critical Edition with Commentary* (SVTP 10; Leiden/New York/Köln: E.J. Brill, 1993).

VanderKam, J.C. (ed.), *The Book of Jubilees. A Critical Text* (CSCO 510 [Aeth. 87]; Leuven: Peeters, 1989).

Wahl, O. (ed.), *Apocalypsis Esdrae, Apocalypsis Sedrach, Visio beati Esdrae* (PVTG 4; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1977).

Qumran

Lohse, E. (ed.), *Die Texte aus Qumran* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, ^{2}1971).

Puech, E., 'Fragment d'une apocalypse en araméen (4Q246 = pseudo-Dan^{d}) et le "royaume de Dieu"', *RB* 99 (1992), pp. 98-131.

Puech, E., 'Une apocalypse messianique (4Q521)', *RdQ* 15 (1992), pp. 475-519.

Strugnell, J.; Dimant, D., '4Q Second Ezekiel (4Q385)', *RdQ* 13 (1988), pp. 45-58.

Jonge, M. de; Woude, A.S. van der, '11Q Melchizedek and the New Testament', *NTS* 12 (1965-66), pp. 301-326.

Philo

Cohn, L.; Wendland, P. (eds.), *Philonis Alexandrini opera quae supersunt*, 6 vols. (Berlin: G. Reimer, W. de Gruyter, 1896-1930).

Josephus

Thackeray, H.St.J. (ed.), *Flavius Josephus, Contra Apionem* (LCL; London: W. Heinemann, New York: G.P. Putnam, 1926).

——, *Flavius Josephus, De Bello Judaico*, 2 vols. (LCL; London: W. Heinemann, New York: G.P. Putnam, 1927-1928).

Thackeray, H.St.J.; Marcus, R.; Wikgren, A.; Feldman, L.H. (eds.), *Flavius Josephus, Antiquitates Judaicae*, 6 vols. (LCL; London: W. Heinemann, New York: G.P. Putnam, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1930-1965).

Apostolic Fathers

Funk, F.X.; Bihlmeyer, K. (eds.), *Die apostolischen Väter* (SQS II,1,1; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], ^{3}1970).

Apocryphal Acts of Apostles

Lipsius, R.A.; Bonnet, M. (eds.), *Acta apostolorum apocrypha*, 3 vols. (Leipzig, 1891-1903; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1959).

Acts of Christian Martyrs

Krüger, G.; Ruhbach, G. (eds.), *Ausgewählte Märtyrerakten* (SQS 3 n.F.; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], ^{4}1965).

Justin Martyr

Goodspeed, E.J. (ed.), *Die ältesten Apologeten* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1914).

Tacitus

Moore, C.H.; Jackson, J. (eds.), *Tacitus, Historiae, Annales*, 4 vols. (LCL; London: W. Heinemann, New York: G.P. Putnam, 1925-1937).

b. *Translations*

All quotations from Biblical books, apocrypha included, are taken from the New Revised Standard Version (1989) unless indicated otherwise. The source Q is quoted in the version transmitted in the gospel according to Luke. The sources of quotations from non-Biblical sources are recorded in the footnotes. In a few cases the present author has altered the wording of the translation he used, if the meaning of the original text seemed to require this.

c. *Secondary literature*

Allison, D.C., *The End of the Ages Has Come. An Early Interpretation of the Passion and Resurrection of Jesus* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1987 [Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985]).

Bachmann, M., 'Rezeption von 1. Kor 15 (V. 12ff.) unter logischem und unter philologischem Aspekt', *LingBibl* 51 (1982), pp. 79-103.

——, 'Zum "argumentum resurrectionis" von 1 Kor. 15,12ff nach Christoph Zimmer, Augustin und Paulus', *LingBibl* 67 (1992), pp. 29-39.

Balz, H.; Schneider, G. (eds.), *Exegetisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, 3 vols. (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1980-1983).

Barth, G., 'Erwägungen zu 1 Kor. 15:20-28', *EvTh* 30 (1970), pp. 515-527.

——, 'Zur Frage nach der in 1 Korinther 15 bekämpften Auferstehungsleugnung', *ZNW* 83 (1992), pp. 187-201.

——, 'Umstrittener Auferstehungsglaube', in: L. Bormann, K. del Tredici, A Standhartinger (eds.), *Religious Propaganda and Missionary Competition in the New Testament World. Essays Honoring Dieter Georgi* (NovT.S 74; Leiden/New York/Köln: E.J. Brill, 1994), pp. 117-132.

Bauer, W., *Griechisch-deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der frühchristlichen Literatur* (Berlin/New York: W. de Gruyter, 6th edition by K. Aland and B. Aland, 1988).

Baumgarten, J., *Paulus und die Apokalyptik. Die Auslegung apokalyptischer Überlieferungen in den echten Paulusbriefen* (WMANT 44; Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1975).

Beasley-Murray, G.R., *Jesus and the Kingdom of God* (Grand Rapids: Wm.B. Eerdmans, Exeter: Paternoster, 1986).

Becker, J., *Auferstehung der Toten im Urchristentum* (SBS 82; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1976).

Berger, K., *Die Auferstehung des Propheten und die Erhöhung des Menschensohnes. Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zur Deutung des Geschicks Jesu in frühchristlichen Texten* (StUNT 13; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1976).

Berger, K.; Colpe, C., *Religionsgeschichtliches Textbuch zum Neuen Testament* (TNT 1; Göttingen/Zürich: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1987).

Best, E., *One Body in Christ, A Study in the Relationship of the Church to Christ in the Epistles of the Apostle Paul* (London: SPCK, 1955).

——, *A Commentary on the First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians* (BNTC; London: A. & C. Black, 1972).

Bieringer, R., 'Traditionsgeschichtlicher Ursprung und theologische Bedeutung der ὑπέρ-Aussagen im Neuen Testament', in: F. Van Segbroeck et alii (eds.), *The Four Gospels*, vol. I, pp. 219-248.

Bieringer, R. (ed.), *The Corinthian Correspondence* (BEThL; Leuven: University Press/Peeters, forthcoming).

Blass, F.; Debrunner, A.; Rehkopf, F.W., *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, [16]1984).

Boer, M.C. de, *The Defeat of Death. Apocalyptic Eschatology in 1 Corinthians 15 and Romans 5* (JSNT.S 22; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1988).

——, 'Paul's Use of a Resurrection Tradition in 1 Corinthians 15:20-28', in: R. Bieringer (ed.), *Correspondence*, forthcoming.

Boer, M.C. de (ed.), *From Jesus to John. Essays on Jesus and New Testament Christology in Honour of Marinus de Jonge* (JSNT.S 84; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993).

Bogaert, P., *L'Apocalypse syriaque de Baruch*, 2 vols. (SC 144-145; Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1969).

Bousset, W., *Die Religion des Judentums im späthellenistischen Zeitalter* (HNT 21; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 3rd edition by H. Gressmann, 1926).

Brandenburger, E., *Adam und Christus. Exegetisch-religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu Röm. 5:12-21 (1. Kor. 15)* (WMANT 7; Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1962).

Breytenbach, C., *Versöhnung. Eine Studie zur paulinischen Soteriologie* (WMANT 60; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1988).

——, 'Versöhnung, Stellvertretung und Sühne. Semantische und traditionsgeschichtliche Bemerkungen am Beispiel der paulinischen Briefe', *NTS* 39 (1993), pp. 59-79.

Broer, I., '"Seid stets bereit, jedem Rede und Antwort zu stehen, der nach der Hoffnung fragt, die euch erfüllt" (1 Petr 3,15). Das leere Grab und die Erscheinungen Jesu im Lichte der historischen Kritik', in: I. Broer, J. Werbich (eds.), *"Der Herr is wahrhaft auferstanden" (Lk 24,34). Biblische und systematische Beiträge zur Entstehung des Osterglaubens* (SBS 134; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1988), pp. 29-61.

Bruce, F.F., 'Paul on Immortality', *SJTh* 24 (1971), pp. 457-475.

Bucher, T.G., 'Die logische Argumentation in 1. Korinther 15,12-20', *Bib* 55 (1974), pp. 465-486.

——, 'Überlegungen zur Logik im Zusammenhang mit 1 Kor 15,12-20', *LingBibl* 53 (1983), pp. 70-98.

Bultmann, R., *Der zweite Brief an die Korinther* (KEK; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, edition by E. Dinkler, 1976).

——, *Theologie des Neuen Testaments* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 9th edition by O. Merk, 1984).

Bünker, M., *Briefformular und rhetorische Disposition im 1. Korintherbrief* (GTA 28; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984).

Carlson, D.C., 'Vengeance and Angelic Mediation in Testament of Moses 9 and 10', *JBL* 101 (1982), pp. 85-95.

Casey, M., 'Idiom and Translation: Some Aspects of the Son of Man Problem', *NTS* 41 (1995), pp. 164-182.

Cavallin, H.C.C., *Life after Death. Paul's Argument for the Resurrection of the Dead in 1 Cor. 15. Part 1: An Enquiry into the Jewish Background* (CB.NT 7:1; Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1974).

——, 'Parusi och uppståndelse. 1 Th. 4:13-18 som kombination av två slags eskatologi', *SvTK* 59 (1983), pp. 54-63.

Chantraine, P., *Histoire du parfait grec* (Collection Linguistique publiée par la Société de Linguistique de Paris 21; Paris: Librairie ancienne H. Champion, 1927).

Charlesworth, J.H. (ed.), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, 2 vols. (Garden City: Doubleday, 1983-1985).

Charlesworth, J.H. (ed., with J. Brownson, M.T. Davis, S.J. Kraftchick, A.F. Segal), *The Messiah. Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992).

Chester, A., 'Jewish Messianic Expectations and Mediatorial Figures and Pauline Christology', in: M. Hengel, U. Keckel (eds.), *Paulus und das antike Judentum* (WUNT 58; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1991), pp. 17-89.

Collins, J.J., *The Sibylline Oracles of Egyptian Judaism* (SBL.DS 13; Missoula: SBL/Scholars Press, 1974).

——, *The Apocalyptic Vision of the Book of Daniel* (HSM 16; Montana: Scholars Press, 1977).

——, 'The Root of Immortality: Death in the Context of Jewish Wisdom', *HThR* 71 (1978), pp. 179-192.

——, 'The Son of Man in First-Century Judaism', *NTS* 38 (1992), pp. 448-466.

——, *Daniel. A Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993).

——, 'The Works of the Messiah', *DSD* 1 (1994), pp. 94-112.

Colpe, C., 'Neue Untersuchungen zum Menschen-Sohn Problem', *ThRv* 77 (1981), pp. 353-372.

Conzelmann, H., *Der erste Brief an die Korinther* (KEK; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, ²1981).

Cranfield, C.E.B., *The Epistle to the Romans*, 2 vols. (ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1975-1979).

Crockett, W.V., 'Ultimate Restoration of all Mankind: 1 Cor. 15:22', in: E.A. Livingstone (ed.), *Studia Biblica 1978. Sixth International Congress on Biblical Studies* (JSNT.S 3; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1980), vol. III, pp. 83-87.

Dahl, N.A., 'The Crucified Messiah', in: N.A. Dahl, *The Crucified Messiah and Other Essays* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1974), pp. 10-36.

Dodd, C.H., *The Parables of the Kingdom* (London: Nisbet, ³1946).

Donahue, J.R., 'Recent Studies on the Origin of "Son of Man" in the Gospels', *CBQ* 48 (1986), pp. 484-498.

Dunn, J.D.G., *Romans 1-8* (WBC; Dallas: Word Books, 1988).

Dupont, J., *ΣΥΝ ΧΡΙΣΤΩΙ. L'union avec le Christ suivant Saint Paul. Première partie: 'Avec le Christ' dans la vie future* (Bruges/Louvain/Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1952).

Eltester, F.-W., *Eikon im Neuen Testament* (BZNW 23; Berlin: A. Töpelmann, 1958).

Fascher, E., 'Anastasis-Resurrectio-Auferstehung. Eine programmatische Studie zur Thema "Sprache und Offenbarung"', *ZNW* 40 (1941), pp. 166-229.

Fee, G.D., *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (NIC; Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm.B. Eerdmans, 1987).

Fischer, K.M., *Das Ostergeschehen* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978, ²1980).

Fitzmyer, J.A., *A Wandering Aramean. Collected Aramaic Essays* (SBL.MS 25; Chico: Scholars Press, 1979), pp. 143-160.

——, 'The Consecutive Meaning of ἐφ' ᾧ in Romans 5.12', *NTS* 39 (1993), pp. 321-339.

Frend, W.H.C., *Martyrdom and Persecution in the Early Church. A Study of a Conflict from the Maccabees to Donatus* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1965).

Freedman, D.N. et alii (eds.), *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, 6 vols. (New York: Doubleday, 1992).

Froitzheim, F., *Christologie und Eschatologie bei Paulus* (fzb 25; Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1979).

García Martínez, F., 'Messianische Erwartungen in den Qumranschriften', *JBTh* 8 (1993), pp. 171-208.

Gillmann, J., 'Signals of Transformation in 1 Thessalonians 4:13-18', *CBQ* 47 (1985), pp. 263-281.

Glasson, T.F., *The Second Advent. The Origin of the New Testament Doctrine* (London: Epworth, 1945, ²1947).

——, 'Theophany and Parousia', *NTS* 34 (1988), pp. 259-270.

Gnilka, J., *Der Philipperbrief* (HBK; Freiburg/Basel/Wien: Herder, 1968).

——, *Das Evangelium nach Markus* (EKK; Zürich: Benzinger Verlag, Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1979).

Grässer, E., *Das Problem der Parusieverzögerung in den synoptischen Evangelien und in der Apostelgeschichte* (BZNW 22; Berlin: A. Töpelmann, 1957, ³1977).

Greshake, G.; Kremer, J., *Resurrectio Mortuorum. Zum theologischen Verständnis der leiblichen Auferstehung* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1986).

Grimm, C.L.W., *Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zu den Apokryphen des Alten Testaments* (4. Lieferung; Leipzig, 1857).

Grundmann, W., 'σύν-μετά mit Genitiv', in: *ThWNT*, vol. VII (1964), pp. 772-773.

Habicht, C., *2. Makkabäerbuch* (JSHRZ I,3; Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1976).

Hahn, F., *Christologische Hoheitstitel. Ihre Geschichte im frühen Christentum* (FRLANT 83; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963, ³1966).

Harnisch, W., *Eschatologische Existenz. Ein exegetischer Beitrag zum Sachanliegen von 1. Thessalonicher 4,13-5,11* (FRLANT 110; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1973).

Harrington, D.J., 'Pseudo-Philo', in: *OTP*, vol. II, pp. 297-377.

Hasenfratz, H.P., *Die Rede von der Auferstehung Jesu Christi. Ein methodologischer Versuch* (FThL 10; Bonn: Linguistica Biblica, 1975).

Hasler, V., 'Credo und Auferstehung in Korinth. Erwägungen zu 1 Kor. 15', *ThZ* 40 (1984), pp. 12-33.

Haufe, G., 'Das Menschensohn-Problem in der gegenwärtigen wissenschaftlichen Diskussion', *EvTh* 16 (1956), pp. 130-141.

——, 'Entrückung und eschatologische Funktion im Spätjudentum', *ZRGG* 13 (1961), pp. 105-113.

Hay, D.M., *Glory at the Right Hand. Psalm 110 in Early Christianity* (SBL.MS 18; Nashville/New York: Abingdon Press, 1973).

Heil, U., 'Theo-logische Interpretation von 1 Kor. 15,23-28', *ZNW* 84 (1993), pp. 27-35.

Hengel, M., 'Ist der Osterglaube noch zu retten?', *ThQ* 153 (1973), pp. 252-269.

Henten, J.W. van, *De joodse martelaren als grondleggers van een nieuwe orde. Een studie uitgaande van 2 en 4 Makkabeeën* (Ph.D. diss., Leiden, 1986).

——, 'The Martyrs as Heroes of the Christian People. Some Remarks on the Continuity between Jewish and Christian Martyrology, with Pagan Analogies', in: M. Lam-

berigts, P. Van Deun (eds.), *Martyrium in Multidisciplinary Perspective* (BEThL 117; Leuven: University Press, Peeters, 1995), pp. 303-322.

Henten, J.W. van (ed., in cooperation with B.A.G.M. Dehandschutter and H.J.W. van der Klaauw), *Die Entstehung der jüdischen Martyrologie* (StPB 38; Leiden/New York/København/Köln: E.J. Brill, 1989).

Hill, C.E., 'Paul's Understanding of Christ's Kingdom in 1 Corinthians 15:20-28', *NovT* 30 (1988), pp. 297-320.

Hoffmann, P., *Die Toten in Christus. Eine religionsgeschichtliche und exegetische Untersuchung zur paulinischen Eschatologie* (NTA 2 n.F.; Münster: Aschendorff, 1966).

——, 'Die historisch-kritische Osterdiskussion von H.S. Reimarus bis zu Beginn des 20. Jahrhunderts', in: P. Hoffmann (ed.), *Überlieferung*, pp. 15-67.

——, 'Auferstehung (II/1)', *TRE*, vol. IV (1979), pp. 478-513.

Hoffmann, P. (ed.), *Zur neutestamentlichen Überlieferung von der Auferstehung Jesu* (WdF 522; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1988).

Hollander, H.W.; Holleman, J., 'The Relationship between Death, Sin, and Law in 1 Cor. 15:56', *NovT* 35 (1993), pp. 270-291.

Holleman, J., 'Als Mensenzoon of als Messias. Over de oorsprong van de verwachting van Jezus' wederkomst', in: H.J. de Jonge, W.B.J. de Ruyter (eds.), *Totdat hij komt. Een discussie over de wederkomst van Jezus Christus* (Baarn: Ten Have, 1995), pp. 47-63.

——, 'Jesus' Resurrection as the Beginning of the Eschatological Resurrection (1 Cor. 15,20)', in: R. Bieringer (ed.), *Correspondence*, forthcoming.

Holtz, T., *Der erste Brief an die Thessalonicher* (EKK; Zürich: Benzinger Verlag, Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1986).

Hooke, S.H., *The Resurrection of Christ as History and Experience* (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1967).

Hooker, M.D., *The Gospel according to Mark* (BNTC; London: A. & C. Black, 1991).

Horsley, R.A., '"How can some of you say there is no resurrection of the dead?" Spiritual Elitism in Corinth', *NovT* 20 (1978), pp. 203-231.

——, 'Pneumatikos vs. Psychikos. Distinctions of Spiritual Status among the Corinthians', *HThR* 69 (1976), pp. 268-288.

Jones, F.S., *'Freiheit' in den Briefen des Apostels Paulus. Eine historische, exegetische und religionsgeschichtliche Studie* (GTA 34; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1987).

Jonge, H.J. de, 'Ontstaan en ontwikkeling van het geloof in Jezus' opstanding', in: M. de Jonge (ed.), *Waarlijk opgestaan! Een discussie over de opstanding van Jezus Christus* (Baarn: Ten Have, 1989, ²1994), pp. 31-50.

——, 'The Original Setting of the ΧΡΙΣΤΟΣ ΑΠΕΘΑΝΕΝ ΥΠΕΡ Formula', in: R.F. Collins (ed.), *The Thessalonian Correspondence* (BEThL 87; Leuven: University Press/Peeters, 1990), pp. 229-235.

——, 'De opstanding van Jezus. De joodse traditie achter een christelijke belijdenis', in: T. Baarda, H.J. de Jonge, M.J.J. Menken (eds.), *Jodendom en vroeg Christendom: continuïteit en discontinuïteit* (Kampen: Kok, 1991), pp. 47-61.

——, *Visionaire ervaring en de historische oorsprong van het Christendom* (inaugural address; Leiden: Leiden University, 1992).

——, 'The Historical Jesus' View of Himself and his Mission', in: M.C. de Boer (ed.), *From Jesus to John*, pp. 30-32.

——, 'De oorsprong van de verwachting van Jezus' wederkomst', in: H.J. de Jonge, W.B.J. de Ruyter (eds.), *Totdat hij komt. Een discussie over de wederkomst van Jezus Christus* (Baarn: Ten Have, 1995), pp. 9-36.

Jonge, M. de, 'The Earliest Christian Use of Christos: Some Suggestions', *NTS* 32 (1986), pp. 321-343.

——, 'Jesus' Death for Others and the Death of the Maccabean Martyrs', in: T. Baarda, A. Hilhorst, G.P. Luttikhuizen, A.S. van der Woude (eds.), *Text and Testimony. Essays on New Testament and Apocryphal Literature* (FS A.F.J. Klijn; Kampen: Kok, 1988), pp. 142-151.

——, *Christology in Context. The Earliest Christian Response to Jesus* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1988).

——, *Jesus, The Servant-Messiah* (New Haven/London: Yale University Press, 1991).

——, 'Christology and Theology in the Context of Early Christian Eschatology, particularly in the Fourth Gospel', in: F. Van Segbroeck et alii (eds.), *The Four Gospels*, vol. III, pp. 1835-1853.

——, 'The Radical Eschatology of the Fourth Gospel and the Eschatology of the Synoptics', in: A. Denaux (ed.), *John and the Synoptics* (BEThL 101; Leuven: University Press/Peeters, 1992), pp. 481-487.

Käsemann, E., *An die Römer* (HNT; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], ^{3}1974).

Kegel, G., *Auferstehung Jesu - Auferstehung der Toten. Eine traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zum Neuen Testament* (Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1970).

Kellermann, U., 'Überwindung des Todesgeschicks in der alttestamentlichen Frömmigkeit vor und neben dem Auferstehungsglauben', *ZThK* 73 (1976), pp. 259-282.

——, *Auferstanden in den Himmel. 2 Makkabäer 7 und die Auferstehung der Märtyrer* (SBS 95; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1979).

——, 'Das Danielbuch und die Märtyrertheologie der Auferstehung', in: J.W. van Henten (ed.), *Entstehung*, pp. 51-75.

Kieffer, R., 'Résurrection du Christ et résurrection générale. Essai de structuration de la pensée paulienne', *NRTh* 103 (1981), pp. 330-344.

Kittel, G.; Friedrich, G. (eds.), *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, 10 vols. (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1933-1979).

Klijn, A.F.J., '2 (Syriac Apocalypse of) Baruch', in: *OTP*, vol. II, pp. 615-652.

Klostermann, E., *Das Matthäusevangelium* (HNT; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], ^{2}1927).

Knibb, M.A., 'The Date of the Parables of Enoch: A Critical Review', *NTS* 25 (1978-79), pp. 345-359.

——, '1 Enoch', in: *AOT*, pp. 169-319.

Koch, K., 'Messias und Menschensohn. Die zweistufige Messianologie der jüngeren Apokalyptik', *JBTh* 8 (1993), pp. 73-102.

Kramer, W., *Christos Kyrios Gottessohn. Untersuchungen zu Gebrauch und Bedeutung der christologischen Bezeichnungen bei Paulus und den vorpaulinischen Gemeinden* (AThANT 44; Zürich/Stuttgart: Zwingli, 1963).

Kratz, R., *Auferweckung als Befreiung. Eine Studie zur Passions- und Auferstehungstheologie des Matthäus, besonders Mt 27,62-28,15* (SBS 65; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1973).

Kraus, W., *Der Tod Jesu als Heiligtumsweihe. Eine Untersuchung zum Umfeld der Sühnevorstellung in Römer 3,25-26a* (WMANT 66; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1991).

Krause, G.; Müller, G (eds.), *Theologische Realenzyklopädie* 24 vols. to date (Berlin/New York: W. de Gruyter, 1977-).

Kreitzer, L.J., *Jesus and God in Paul's Eschatology* (JSNT.S 19; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987).

Kremer, J., *Das älteste Zeugnis von der Auferstehung Christi. Eine bibeltheologische Studie zur Aussage und Bedeutung von 1 Kor 15,1-11* (SBS 17; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1966).

——, 'ἐγείρω', *EWNT*, vol. I (1980), pp. 899-910.

Kuck, D.W., *Judgment and Community Conflict. Paul's Use of Apocalyptic Judgment Language in 1 Corinthians 3:5-4:5* (NovT.S 66; Leiden/New York/København/Köln: E.J. Brill, 1992).

Kühner, R.; Gerth, B., *Ausführliche Grammatik der Griechischen Sprache*, 4 vols. (Hannover/Leipzig: Hahnsche Buchhandlung, ³1898).

Kümmel, W.G., 'Der persönliche Anspruch sowie der Prozess und Kreuzestod Jesu', *ThR* 56 n.F. (1991), pp. 391-420.

Kuss, O., *Der Römerbrief* (Regensburg: F. Pustet, 1978).

Lambrecht, J., 'Paul's Christological Use of Scripture in 1 Cor. 15:20-28', *NTS* 28 (1982), pp. 502-527.

——, 'Structure and Line of Thought in 1 Cor. 15:23-28', *NovT* 32 (1990), pp. 143-151.

Lang, F.G., *2. Korinther 5,1-10 in der neueren Forschung* (BGBE 16; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1973).

Larcher, C., *Études sur le livre de la sagesse* (EtB; Paris: J. Gabalda, 1969).

——, *Le livre de la sagesse de Solomon* (EtB 1-3; Paris: J. Gabalda, 1983-1985).

Levison, J.R., *Portraits of Adam in Early Judaism. From Sirach to 2 Baruch* (JSPE.S 1; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1988).

Licht, J., 'Taxo, or the Apocalyptic Doctrine of Vengeance', *JJS* 12 (1961), pp. 95-103.

Liddell, H.G.; Scott, R.; Jones, H.S., *A Greek-English Lexicon* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, ⁹1940, with a supplement, 1968).

Lietaert Peerbolte, L.J., *The Antecedents of Antichrist. A Traditio-Historical Study of the Earliest Christian Views on Eschatological Opponents* (Ph.D. diss. Leiden, 1995).

Lietzmann, H., *An die Römer* (HNT; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1928).

——, *An die Korinther I-II* (HNT; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 4th edition augmented by W.G. Kümmel, 1949).

Lindars, B., 'The Sound of the Trumpet: Paul and Eschatology', *BJRL* 67 (1984-85), pp. 766-782.

Lindemann, A., 'Paulus und die korinthische Eschatologie. Zur These von einer "Entwicklung" im paulinischen Denken', *NTS* 37 (1991), pp. 373-399.

Lohmeyer, E., 'ΣΥΝ ΧΡΙΣΤΩΙ', in: *Festgabe für A. Deissmann* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1927), pp. 218-257.

——, *Das Evangelium des Markus* (KEK; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1951).

——, *Die Briefe an die Philipper, an die Kolosser und an Philemon* (KEK; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1953).

Lohse, E., *Grundriß der neutestamentlichen Theologie* (ThW 5; Stuttgart/Berlin/Köln/Mainz: W. Kohlhammer, ²1979).

Lüdemann, G., *Paulus, der Heidenapostel. Band I. Studien zur Chronologie* (FRLANT 123; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1980).

——, *Die Auferstehung Jesu. Historie, Erfahrung, Theologie* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994).

Lührmann, D., *Die Redaktion der Logienquelle* (WMANT 33; Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1969).

——, *Das Markusevangelium* (HNT; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1987).
Luz, U., *Das Geschichtsverständnis des Paulus* (BEvTh 49; München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1968).
——, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus* (EKK; Zürich: Benzinger Verlag, Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1990).
Maisch, I., 'Die osterliche Dimension des Todes Jesu. Zur Osterverkündigung in Mt 27,51-54', in: L. Oberlinner (ed.), *Auferstehung*, pp. 96-123.
Malherbe, A.J., 'The Beasts at Ephesus', *JBL* 87 (1968), pp. 71-80.
——, 'Determinism and Free Will in Paul: The Argument of 1 Corinthians 8 and 9', in: T. Engberg-Pedersen (ed.), *Paul in his Hellenistic Context* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1994), pp. 231-255.
Marshall, I.H., *The Gospel of Luke. A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Exeter: Paternoster, 1978).
Martin, R.P., *2 Corinthians* (WBC; Waco: Word Books, 1986).
Marxsen, W., 'Die Auferstehung Jesu als historisches und als theologisches Problem', in: W. Marxsen, U. Wilckens, G. Delling, H.G. Geyer, *Die Bedeutung der Auferstehungsbotschaft für den Glauben an Jesus Christus* (Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1966), pp. 9-39.
——, *Die Auferstehung Jesu von Nazareth* (Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1968).
——, 'Auslegung von 1 Thess 4,13-18', *ZThK* 66 (1969), pp. 21-37.
Mattern, L., *Das Verständnis des Gerichtes bei Paulus* (AThANT 47; Zürich/Stuttgart: Zwingli, 1966).
McArthur, H.K., '"On the third day". 1 Cor. 15:4b and Rabbinic Interpretation of Hosea 6:2', *NTS* 18 (1971/72), pp. 81-86.
McKay, K.L., 'The Use of the Ancient Greek Perfect down to the Second Century A.D.', *BICS* 12 (1965), pp. 1-21.
Merklein, H., 'Die Auferweckung Jesu und die Anfänge der Christologie (Messias bzw. Sohn Gottes und Menschensohn)', *ZNW* 72 (1981), pp. 1-26.
——, 'Der Theologe als Prophet. Zur Funktion prophetischen Redens im theologischen Diskurs des Paulus', *NTS* 38 (1992), pp. 402-429.
Meyer, R., 'κόλπος', *ThWNT*, vol. III (1938), pp. 824-826.
Molitor, H., *Die Auferstehung der Christen und Nichtchristen nach dem Apostel Paulus* (NTA XVI.1; Münster i. W.: Aschendorff, 1933).
Moore, A.L., *The Parousia in the New Testament* (NovT.S 13; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1966).
Moule, C.F.D., *The Origin of Christology* (Cambridge/London/New York/Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 1977).
Moulton, J.H.; Howard, W.; Turner, N., *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, 4 vols. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, I, ³1919; II, 1929; III, 1963, IV, 1976).
Mowinckel, S., *He that Cometh* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1956).
Münderlein, G., *Die Überwindung der Mächte. Studien zu theologischen Vorstellungen des apokalyptischen Judentums und bei Paulus* (Ph.D. diss., Zürich, 1971).
Murphy-O'Connor, J., *The Theology of the Second Letter to the Corinthians* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), p. 137.
——, 'Faith and Resurrection in 2 Cor. 4:13-14', *RB* 95 (1988), pp. 543-550.
Mussner, F., *Die Auferstehung Jesu* (BiH 7; München: Kösel Verlag, 1969).
——, *Der Galaterbrief* (HThK; Freiburg/Basel/Wien: Herder, 1974).
Nagel, M., *La vie grecque d'Adam et d'Eve. Apocalypse de Moïse*, 3 vols. (Ph.D. diss., Strasbourg, 1972).
Nelis, J.T., *II Makkabeeën uit de grondtekst vertaald en uitgelegd* (Bussum: Romen, 1975).

Neusner, J.; Green, W.S.; Frerichs, E.S. (eds.), *Judaisms and Their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era* (Cambridge: University Press, 1987).

Nickelsburg, G.W.E., *Resurrection, Immortality and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism* (HThS 26; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1972).

——, 'Son of Man', *ABD*, vol. VI, pp. 137-150.

Nineham, D.E., *The Gospel of St Mark* (PGC; Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1963).

Nützel, J.M., 'Zum Schicksal der eschatologischen Propheten', *BZ* 20 n.F. (1976), pp. 59-94.

Oberlinner, L. (ed.), *Auferstehung Jesu - Auferstehung der Christen. Deutungen des Osterglaubens* (QD 105; Freiburg/Basel/Wien: Herder, 1986).

Oepke, A., 'παρουσία', *ThWNT*, vol. V (1954), pp. 856-869.

Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft, 72 vols. (Stuttgart: Metzler, München: Druckenmüller, Neuausgabe von G. Wissowa et alii, 1894-1980).

Perkins, P., *Resurrection: New Testament Witness and Contemporary Reflection* (London: Chapman, 1984).

Perrin, N., *Rediscovering the Teaching of Jesus* (NTLi; London: SCM Press, 1967).

Perrot, C.; Bogaert, P., *Les Antiquités Bibliques* (SC 230; Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1976).

Pesch, R., *Jesu ureigene Taten? Ein Beitrag zur Wunderfrage* (QD 52; Freiburg/Basel/Wien: Herder, 1970).

——, 'Zur Entstehung des Glaubens an die Auferstehung Jesu', *ThQ* 153 (1973), pp. 201-228.

——, 'Zur Entstehung des Glaubens an die Auferstehung Jesu. Ein neuer Versuch', *FZPhTh* 30 (1983), pp. 73-98; also in: P. Hoffmann (ed.), *Überlieferung*, pp. 228-255.

Pollard, T.E., 'Martyrdom and Resurrection in the New Testament', *BJRL* 55 (1972-73), pp. 240-251.

Porter, J.R., 'The Legal Aspects of the Concept of "Corporate Personality" in the Old Testament', *VT* 15 (1965), pp. 361-380.

Priest, J., 'A Note on the Messianic Banquet', in: J.H. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Messiah*, pp. 222-238.

Puech, E., *La croyance des Esséniens en la vie future: immortalité, résurrection, vie eternelle? Histoire d'une croyance dans le Judaïsme ancien* (EtB 22 n.s.; Paris: J. Gabalda, 1993).

Rad, G. von; Delling, G., 'ἡμέρα', *ThWNT*, vol. II (1935), pp. 945-956.

Radl, W., *Ankunft des Herrn. Zur Bedeutung und Funktion der Parusieaussagen bei Paulus* (BET 15; Frankfurt a. M./Bern/Cirencester [U.K.]: Peter D. Lang, 1981).

Rigaux, B., *Saint Paul. Les épîtres aux Thessaloniciens* (EtB; Paris: J. Gabalda, Gembloux: J. Duculot, 1956).

Robinson, J.A.T., *Jesus and His Coming. The Emergence of a Doctrine* (London: SCM, 1957).

Rogerson, J.W., 'The Hebrew Conception of Corporate Personality: a Reexamination', *JThS* 21 n.s. (1970), pp. 1-16.

Rohde, E., Psyche. *Seelencult und Unsterblichkeitsglaube der Griechen* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], ^{8}1921).

Rowland, C., *Christian Origins. An Account of the Setting and Character of the Most Important Messianic Sect of Judaism* (London: SPCK, 1985).

Ruppert, L., *Jesus als der leidende Gerechte? Der Weg Jesu im Lichte eines alt- und zwischentestamentlichen Motivs* (SBS 59; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1972).

——, 'Erhöhungsvorstellungen im Alten Testament', *BZ* 22 n.F. (1978), pp. 199-220.

Russell, D.S., *The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic 200 B.C - A.D. 100* (London: SCM Press, 1964).

Schade, H.-H., *Apokalyptische Christologie bei Paulus. Studien zum Zusammenhang von Christologie und Eschatologie in den Paulusbriefen* (GTA 18; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981, ²1984).

Scharbert, J., *Solidarität in Segen und Fluch im Alten Testament und in seiner Umwelt. I. Väterfluch und Vätersegen* (BBB 14; Bonn: P. Hanstein, 1958).

Schmeller, T., *Paulus und die 'Diatribe'. Eine vergleichende Stilinterpretation* (NTA 19 n.F.; Münster: Aschendorff, 1987).

Schmithals, W., *Der Römerbrief. Ein Kommentar* (Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1988).

Schnelle, U., *Gerechtigkeit und Christusgegenwart: vorpaulinische und paulinische Tauftheologie* (GTA 24; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1983).

Schubert, K., Review of Marxsen's book (*Die Auferstehung Jesu von Nazareth*) in: *Kairos* 11 n.F. (1969), pp. 145-149.

Schulz, S., Q. *Die Spruchquelle der Evangelisten* (Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1972).

Schürer, E., *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.- A.D. 135)*, 4 vols. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, a new English version revised and edited by G. Vermes, F. Millar, M. Black, 1973-1987).

Schweizer, E., *Erniedrigung und Erhöhung bei Jesus und seinen Nachfolgern* (AThANT 28; Zürich: Zwingli, 1955).

——, 'Die "Mystik" des Sterbens und Auferstehens mit Christus bei Paulus', in: E. Schweizer, *Beiträge zur Theologie des Neuen Testaments. Neutestamentliche Aufsätze (1955-1970)* (Zürich: Zwingli, 1970), pp. 183-203; this is a slightly revised version of his article, 'Dying and Rising with Christ', *NTS* 14 (1967-68), pp. 1-14.

——, '1 Korinther 15,20-28 als Zeugnis paulinischer Eschatologie und ihrer Verwandschaft mit der Verkündigung Jesu', in: E.E. Ellis, E. Grässer (eds.), *Jesus und Paulus* (FS W.G. Kümmel; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1975), pp. 301-314.

——, *Theologische Einleitung in das Neue Testament* (GNT 2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989).

Scroggs, R., *The Last Adam. A Study in Pauline Anthropology* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966).

Segbroeck, F. Van; Tuckett, C.M.; Van Belle, G.; Verheyden, J. (eds.), *The Four Gospels 1992*, 3 vols. (FS F. Neirynck; BEThL 100; Leuven: University Press/Peeters, 1992).

Seidensticker, P., *Die Auferstehung Jesu in der Botschaft der Evangelisten. Ein traditionsgeschichtlicher Versuch zum Problem der Sicherung der Osterbotschaft in der apostolischen Zeit* (SBS 26; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1967).

Sellin, G., *Der Streit um die Auferstehung der Toten. Eine religionsgeschichtliche und exegetische Untersuchung von 1 Korinther 15* (FRLANT 138; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986).

Siber, P., *Mit Christus leben. Eine Studie zur paulinischen Auferstehungshoffnung* (AThANT 61; Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1971).

Sint, J., 'Parusie-Erwartung und Parusie-Verzögerung im paulinischen Briefcorpus', *ZKTh* 86 (1964), pp. 47-79.

Slater, B., 'One like a Son of Man in First-Century C.E. Judaism', *NTS* 41 (1995), pp. 183-198.

Sparks, H.F.D. (ed.), *The Apocryphal Old Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984).

Spittler, R.P., 'Testament of Job', in: *OTP*, vol I, pp. 829-868.

Spörlein, B., *Die Leugnung der Auferstehung. Eine historisch-kritische Untersuchung zu 1 Kor 15* (BU 7; Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet Regensburg, 1971).

Stanley, C.D., *Paul and the Language of Scripture. Citation Technique in the Pauline Epistles and Contemporary Literature* (MSSNTS 69; Cambridge: University Press, 1992).

Stauffer, E., *Die Theologie des Neuen Testaments* (Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, ⁴1948).

Steck, O.H., *Israel und das gewaltsame Geschick der Propheten. Untersuchungen zur Überlieferung des deuteronomistischen Geschichtsbilds im Alten Testament, Spätjudentum und Christentum* (WMANT 23; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1967).

Stemberger, G., *Der Leib der Auferstehung. Studien zur Anthropologie und Eschatologie des palästinischen Judentums im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter (ca. 170 v.Chr. - 100 n.Chr.)* (AnBib 56; Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1972).

Stengel, P., 'ἀπαρχαί', *PRE*, vol. I (1894), cols. 2666-2668.

Stone, M.E., *Fourth Ezra. A Commentary on the Book of Fourth Ezra* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990).

Stowers, S.K., *The Diatribe and Paul's Letter to the Romans* (SBL.DS 57; Chico: Scholars Press, 1981).

Strack, H.L.; Billerbeck, P., *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*, 7 vols. (München: Oskar Beck, 1922-1961).

Sysling, H., *Techiyat ha-Metim. De opstanding van de doden in de Palestijnse Targumim op de Pentateuch en overeenkomstige tradities in de klassieke Rabbijnse bronnen* (Zutphen: Terra, 1991).

Tannehill, R.C., *Dying and Rising with Christ. A Study in Pauline Theology* (BZNW 32; Berlin: A. Töpelmann, 1967).

Theisohn, J., *Der auserwählte Richter. Untersuchungen zum traditionsgeschichtlichen Ort der Menschensohngestalt der Bilderreden des Äthiopischen Henoch* (StUNT 12; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1975).

Thrall, M.E., *Greek Particles in the New Testament. Linguistic and Exegetical Studies* (NTTS 3; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1962).

——, *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians* (ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1994).

Thüsing, W., *Erhöhungsvorstellung und Parusieerwartung in der ältesten nachösterlichen Christologie* (SBS 42; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1969).

Tödt, H.E., *Der Menschensohn in der synoptischen Überlieferung* (Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1959).

Tromp, J., 'Taxo, the Messenger of the Lord', *JSJ* 21 (1990), pp. 200-209.

——, *The Assumption of Moses. A Critical Edition with Commentary* (SVTP 10; Leiden/New York/Köln: E.J. Brill, 1993).

Tuckett, C.M., 'The Son of Man in Q', in: M.C. de Boer (ed.), *From Jesus to John*, pp. 195-215.

——, '"How can some of you say there is no resurrection of the dead?" (1 Cor. 15:12)', in: R. Bieringer (ed.), *Correspondence*, forthcoming.

Uhlig, J., *Das äthiopische Henochbuch* (JSHRZ V, 6; Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1987).

VanderKam, J.C., *The Book of Jubilees* (CSCO 511 [Aeth. 88]; Louvain: Peeters, 1989).

——, 'Righteous One, Messiah, Chosen One, and Son of Man in 1 Enoch 37-71', in: J.H. Charlesworth (ed.), *Messiah*, pp. 169-191.

Vaux, R. de, *Les institutions de l'Ancien Testament*, 2 vols. (Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1960).

Vielhauer, P., 'Gottesreich und Menschensohn in der Verkündigung Jesu', in: P. Vielhauer, *Aufsätze zum Neuen Testament* (TB 31; München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1965), pp. 68-69.

——, *Geschichte der urchristlichen Literatur. Einleitung in das Neue Testament, die Apokryphen und die Apostolischen Väter* (Berlin/New York: W. de Gruyter, 1975).

Vögtle, A.; Pesch, R., *Wie kam es zum Osterglauben* (Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1975).

Vollenweider, S., *Freiheit als neue Schöpfung. Eine Untersuchung zur Eleutheria bei Paulus und in seiner Umwelt* (FRLANT 147; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989).

Volz, P., *Die Eschatologie der jüdischen Gemeinde im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], ²1934).

Vos, J.S., 'Vragen rondom de plaastvervangende zoendood van Jezus in het Nieuwe Testament', *GTT* 93 (1993), pp. 210-231.

Walker, W.O., 'The Son of Man: Some Recent Developments', *CBQ* 45 (1983), pp. 584-607.

Wedderburn, A.J.M., 'The Body of Christ and Related Concepts in 1 Corinthians', *SJTh* 24 (1971), pp. 74-95.

——, 'Some Observations on Paul's Use of the Phrases "In Christ" and "With Christ"', *JSNT* 25 (1985), pp. 83-97.

——, *Baptism and Resurrection. Studies in Pauline Theology against Its Graeco-Roman Background* (WUNT 44; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1987).

Weiss, J., *Der erste Korintherbrief* (KEK; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1910).

——, *Das Urchristentum* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1917).

Wengst, K., *Christologische Formeln und Lieder des Urchristentums* (ZNT 7; Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1972).

Wilcke, H.-A., *Das Problem eines messianischen Zwischenreichs bei Paulus* (AThANT 51; Zürich/Stuttgart: Zwingli, 1967).

Wilckens, U., 'Der Ursprung der Überlieferung der Erscheinungen des Auferstandenen. Zur traditionsgeschichtlichen Analyse von 1. Kor. 15,1-11', in: W. Joest, W. Pannenberg (eds.), *Dogma und Denkstrukturen* (FS E. Schlink; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963), pp. 56-95.

——, *Auferstehung. Das biblische Auferstehungszeugnis historisch untersucht und erklärt* (ThTh 4; Stuttgart/Berlin: Kreuz-Verlag, 1970).

——, *Der Brief an die Römer*, 2 vols. to date (EKK; Zürich: Benziger Verlag, Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1980-).

Windisch, H., *Der zweite Korintherbrief* (KEK; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1924).

Wolff, C., *Der erste Brief des Paulus an die Korinther* (ThHK; Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1982).

——, *Der zweite Brief des Paulus an die Korinther* (ThHK; Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1989).

Woude, A.S. van der, *Die messianischen Vorstellungen der Gemeinde von Qumran* (SSN 3; Assen: Van Gorcum, 1957).

Yarbro Collins, A., 'Daniel 7 and the Historical Jesus', in: H.W. Attridge, J.J. Collins, T.H. Tobin (eds.), *Of Scribes and Scrolls. Studies on the Hebrew Bible, Intertestamental Judaism, and Christian Origins presented to John Strugnell* (Lanham/New York/London: University Press of America, 1990), pp. 187-193.

Zimmer, C., 'Das argumentum resurrectionis 1 Kor. 15,12-20', *LingBibl* 65 (1991), pp. 25-36.

Zwaan, J. de, *Syntaxis der wijzen en tijden in het Grieksche Nieuwe Testament* (a Dutch revision of E. de Witt Burton, *Syntax of Moods and Tenses in New Testament Greek* [Edinburgh, 1894]; Haarlem: H.D. Tjeenk Willink, 1906).

INDEX LOCORUM

Bible (including apocrypha)

Genesis
2:24 193
3:19 55
5:24 146
12:2 177
18:18 175
22:18 177
26:4 177

Exodus
18:19 177
23:16 50
25:2-3 50
34:22 50

Leviticus
16:11 177
23:10 50
23:15-21 50

Numbers
15:17-21 50
16:22 177
18:8 50
18:11 50

1 Samuel
16:7 97

2 Samuel
24:17 177

2 Kings
2:11 151
23:26 177

Job
42:17(LXX) 87, 126

Psalms
8:7 63-64
78(77):51 50
105(104):36 50
110(109):1 59-60, 63-64
115:1(LXX) 191
117:26(LXX) 102

Ecclesiastes
3:19-21 93

Isaiah
2:2-3 84
11:11 99
23 82
25:6-7 84
25:8 65
26 6
26:19 13, 83
43:6 99
56:6-7 84

Jeremiah
17:10 97

Ezekiel
26-28 82
44:30 50
45:13 50

Daniel
7:9-14 110
7:9 109
7:13-14 29
7:13 109, 112
7:15-28 110
10:2-21 127
12:1-3 6, 9, 155
12:2-3 127-128
12:2 13, 79, 87, 93, 155

Hosea
6:2 144
13:14 65

Jonah
2:1 144

Zephaniah
3:15-17 199

Zechariah
9:8-10 199

Tobit
2:1 50
13:11 84
14:6-7 84

Wisdom of Solomon
2-4 150-152
2-5 9, 93, 155, 205
2:1-20 151
2:19-20 152
3:1-3 150
3:1-6 150-152
3:5-6 152
3:5 152
3:6 151-152
3:7-9 150-152
3:7 150-152
4:7-15 150-152
4:10 150
4:14 150
4:15 151
4:16-5:23 151-152
4:16 151
4:18 150
5:1-7 151
7:18 60

Sirach
15:14-17 55
17:27 93
25:24 55
41:1-12 93

1 Maccabees
2:50 182
6:44 182

2 Maccabees
2:21 148
4:34 148
7 13, 146-149, 205
7:9 146, 148
7:14 134, 146, 148
7:22-23 148
7:23 146
7:33 152
7:36 146, 152
7:37-38 146, 182
7:37 182
8:1-5 182
8:21 182
12:31-32 50
12:34 146
12:43-45 93
12:43-44 147
13:14 182
14:37-46 148
14:46 148
15:12-16 148

4 Maccabees
5:37 149
7:18-19 80
7:19 149
9:8 149
13:16 153
16:25 80, 149
17:5 149
17:11-13 149
17:18 149
18:23 149

4 Ezra
3:7 55
3:21 55
6:26 96, 155
7:26-44 127-129, 204
7:26-29 61
7:28-29 104-105
7:28 96, 155, 199
7:32-44 79, 93
7:32 85, 87, 127
7:33-44 97
7:116-126 55
8:51 96, 155
8:53 65
8:62 96, 155
11:37-12:3 104-105
12:31-34 104-105
12:31-33 97
12:34 60
13:1-13 104-106, 109
13:3 109
13:25-26 104-105
13:33-38 104-105
13:37-38 97
13:51-52 104-105
13:52 96, 109, 155
14:9 96, 155

Matthew
8:11-12 84-85
8:11 75, 83, 91-92, 153
10:22 60
10:32-33 101, 114, 119
10:32 75

11:4-5 75, 83, 91-92
11:12-13 92
11:21-23 75, 82, 84, 90
12:28 92
12:38-42 81-82, 84, 90
12:41-42 75
17:9 140
19:28 75, 82, 84, 91-92, 101
20:28 141, 181
23:39 75, 102, 113-114
24:3 98
24:6 60
24:13 60
24:27 75, 98, 101, 116
24:37 75, 98, 101
24:39 75, 98
24:43 101
24:44 75, 101, 116
27:52 136-137
27:64 140
28:7 140

Mark
1:15 60, 92
8:31 115, 141
8:38 75, 99-100, 114, 119
9:1 75, 79, 89-90
9:9 140
9:31 115, 141
10:32-34 115
10:34 141
10:45 141, 181
12:10-11 141
12:18-27 75, 79-80, 89
12:35-37 64, 120
12:36 63-64
13:26-27 99-100
13:26 75, 116
13:32 120
14:62 29, 75, 99-100, 120
15:39 120
16:14 141, 181

Luke
7:22 75, 83, 91-92
9:32 193
10:13-15 75, 82, 84, 90
11:20 92
11:29-32 81-82, 84, 90
11:31-32 75
12:8-9 101, 114, 119
12:8 75
12:39 101
12:40 75, 101, 116
13:28-29 84-85
13:28 75, 83, 91-92, 153
13:35 75, 102, 113-114
14:14 75
16:16 92
16:22 153
17:24 75, 101, 116
17:26 75, 101
17:30 75
22-24 14
22:30 75, 82, 84, 91-92, 101
23:43 144
24:46 140

John
2:22 140
3:14 144
5:21-29 75
5:21 55
6:39 75
6:40 75
6:44 75
6:54 75
11:50 141, 181
11:51 141, 181
11:52 75
13:23 153
14:3 75
14:16-28 76
17:24 75
18:14 141, 181
20:9 140
21:14 140
21:22-23 75

Acts
1:3 193
2:22-24 141, 149
2:24 140, 148
2:32 140, 148
2:34-35 64-65
2:36 62, 141, 149
3:13 141, 149
3:14-15 141, 149
3:15 140
3:26 140, 148
4:10 140-141, 149
5:30 140-141, 149
9:41 193
10:39-40 141, 149
10:40 140
10:41 140

13:28-30 141, 149
13:30 140
13:32 148
13:33 140, 148
13:34 140
13:37 140
17:3 140
17:31 140, 148
23:8 80
23:24 193
24:15 75
24:21 75
26:23 136, 204

Romans
1:3-4 160
1:4 133-134
1:18 158
2:5-12 79
2:5-6 97
2:16 97
3:6 79, 97
4:17 55
4:24 140
4:25 141, 148, 181
5:6 141, 181
5:7 141, 181
5:8 141, 181
5:8-10 183
5:9-10 181
5:9 61, 71, 95-96
5:12-21 21, 56, 180
5:12 180
6:1-11 16-18, 20
6:4-5 196
6:4 140, 169-170, 188-189, 196
6:5-8 201
6:5 16, 71, 77-78, 169-170, 196, 201, 206
6:6 200
6:8 17, 78, 171, 198-201
6:9 140
6:11 170
6:13 154, 169-170
7:4 140, 189
8:3 159
8:11 55, 71, 77-78, 140, 167, 171, 196, 200, 206
8:13 190
8:15-17 168
8:17 74, 168-169
8:18 158
8:23 50, 54, 61, 158
8:29 134-135
8:32 141, 181
8:34 62, 141, 148
8:38 63
9:3 141, 181
10:9 61, 134, 140, 160
11:15 154
11:16 50
13:12 95
14:8 168
14:9 62, 134, 141-142, 148, 181
14:10 54, 97, 123, 193
14:15 141, 181
14:17 61
16:5 50

1 Corinthians
1:7-8 61, 71, 74
1:7 95
1:8 98
1:13 141, 181
1:20 158
2:6 158
2:8 158
2:10-3:9 39
3:3 39
3:12-15 71, 95, 98
3:13 61
3:18 158
4:1-5 97
4:4 158
4:5 54, 71, 95
4:18 39
4:20 61
5:5 63, 71, 95, 98
5:13 79, 97
6:2 79
6:9-10 61
6:12-20 39, 56
6:14 71, 77-78, 140, 172-173, 197
6:15-17 172
6:16 197
6:19 172
7:26 158
7:29 158
8:1-13 39
8:4-5 63
8:8 193
8:11 141, 181
8:34 62
10:11 60, 159
10:20 63

11:26 71, 95, 98
12:12-31 56
12:12 197
12:13 197
14:1-40 40
15 71
15:1-3 42
15:3-5 91, 141, 143, 148
15:3-4 45
15:4 44, 144
15:5-7 4, 6, 42, 143
15:11 42
15:12-19 7-8, 41-44, 80, 137
15:12 35, 39, 44, 140
15:13 42-44, 140
15:14 44, 140
15:15 140
15:16 44, 140
15:17-19 36
15:17-18 45
15:17 44, 140
15:18 44
15:20-28 20, 54
15:20-23 44
15:20-22 15, 196, 200
15:20-21 21
15:20 4, 12, 15, 44, 49, 51, 133-138, 140, 145, 161, 196, 204, 206
15:21-22 38, 44-46, 51-52, 55, 171, 180, 196
15:22 22, 53, 167
15:23-28 58, 95, 128-129
15:23 22, 38, 43-44, 51-54, 71, 95, 98, 123-124, 133, 167, 196, 203-204
15:24-28 46
15:24-27 62
15:24-26 38
15:24 52-54, 58-61
15:25 59, 134
15:26 84
15:27 59
15:28 59, 200
15:29-34 41, 47
15:29 36, 41, 147
15:30-32 41
15:32-34 36, 47
15:33-34 41
15:34 39
15:45-49 21, 37
15:47-49 81, 145
15:49 134, 143
15:50 61
15:51-52 74, 79, 97, 168-169, 193
15:54-55 38, 65
15:56 56
16:15 50
16:17 98
16:22 71, 95, 98
16:23 27

2 Corinthians
1:3-7 190
1:14 71, 74, 95, 98
1:22 54, 158
3:18 74, 134
4:10-12 191-192
4:13 191
4:14 16, 77, 140, 181-195, 200
4:15 192
5:1-5 72, 74, 168, 193
5:2 72
5:3 71-73
5:8 198
5:10 54, 71, 95, 97, 123
5:14-15 189
5:14 141, 181, 185, 194
5:15 141, 148, 181
5:17 183
5:20 181
5:21 141
7:6 98
7:7 98
10:10 98
11:2 191, 193
11:15 79
12:9 190
12:14 191
13:1 191
13:4 16, 77, 141-142, 148, 190-191, 193, 200

Galatians
1:1 140
1:4 141, 158, 181
2:24 197
2:19 189, 200
2:20 141, 181
2:21 141, 181
3:6-14 178
3:6-7 179
3:6 175, 179
3:8-9 21, 175, 181
3:8 176
3:9 175

3:13 141, 179, 181
3:14 176
3:16 178
3:24 179
3:28-29 56
4:4-5 159
4:4 60
4:8-9 66
5:21 61
5:24 190
6:14 190

Ephesians
1:20-22 64
1:20 140
5:2 141, 181
5:25 141, 181

Philippians
1:6 71, 74, 95, 98
1:10 71, 74, 95
1:23 14, 16, 96, 154, 198-199
1:26 98, 195
1:28 79
1:29 141, 181
2:6-11 134, 159-160
2:9 61, 144
2:12 98
2:16 71, 95, 98
3:9-10 96
3:10-11 74, 77, 154
3:10 14, 134, 193
3:20-21 72, 74, 96-97, 123
3:20 62, 71, 95-96
3:21 79, 134, 168
4:1 95
4:5 95

Colossians
1:15 135
1:18 135-136, 204
1:24 190
2:11-17 17
2:12 140
3:4 16

1 Thessalonians
1:3 71, 95
1:10 62, 70-71, 95-96, 140, 143
2:12 61
2:15 141
2:19 70-71, 95, 98
3:13 70-71, 74, 95, 98, 155
4:13-18 22-23, 26, 128-129, 200-201
4:13-14 24-25
4:14-17 171-172
4:14 73, 141, 148, 172, 193
4:15 26, 88-90, 98
4:15-17 193
4:16-17 22, 24-25, 69, 71, 95-96, 123-124, 144, 203-204
4:16 96
4:17 16, 70-71, 171, 172, 193, 198-199
5:1-4 61, 71, 95, 101
5:10 16, 70-71, 141, 171-172, 181, 193, 199
5:23 70-71, 74, 95, 98

2 Thessalonians
2:1-2 75
2:1 98
2:8 75, 98

1 Timothy
2:6 141, 181

2 Timothy
2:8 45, 140
2:18 36, 75

Titus
2:14 141, 181

Hebrews
1:13-2:9 64
1:13 64
2:9 141, 181
2:14 64
5:8-10 144
6:2 75
9:11-12 144
10:12-13 64, 67
11:9 140
11:35 75
12:2 141, 144, 148

James
5:7-8 75, 98

1 Peter
1:21 140
2:21 141, 181
3:18 55, 141-142, 148
3:22 64

4:7 60

2 Peter
1:16 75, 98
3:1-13 75
3:4 98
3:18 148

1 John
2:28 75, 98

Revelation
1:5 135-136, 204
1:18 141-142, 148
2:8 141-142, 148
3:14 135
3:20 16
11:3-13 11-13
20:4-6 12, 75
20:12-13 75
22:20 27

Jewish literature

Pseudepigrapha
2 Apocalypse of Baruch
17:3 55
19:8 55
21:23-24 87
23:4 55
29:3-30:1 104
29:4-8 84
30:1-2 87
30:1 127-128, 186, 204
39:7-40:4 104, 106-107
42:7-8 87
50-51 128
50:2-4 87
51:5 81
51:10 81
54:15 55, 180
72:2-73:1 104
83:3 97

Greek Apocalypse of Ezra
3:13 60

Apocalypse of Moses
10:2 87
13:3 87, 125-126
28:4 87
41:2 87

Assumption of Moses
9-10 162, 205
9:7 162
10:1 162
10:3 163

Biblical Antiquities
3:10 65, 79, 87, 93, 126-127, 152
19:12 152
23:13 127, 152
26:13 127
28:10 152
29:4 152
32:2-3 152-153
32:13 152
33:3-5 127
40:4 152-153, 205

1 Enoch
11:15 150
22 6, 85
37-71 6, 104
38:2 106, 109
46:4-6 106
49:3 186
49:4 106
51 6, 127-129, 204
51:1-5 79, 87, 93
51:3 106
51:4 81
51:5 106, 109
53:6 109
55:4 106
61:8-9 97
61:8 106
61:9 106
62:2-3 106
62:14 84, 106, 199
66:5 105
69:26-29 109
69:27 106
69:29 106, 109
70:4 80
71 10
71:16-17 199
91:10 87, 126
99:3 101
102:4-5 85
102:6-8 93
103:3-4 85
105:2 199
104:6 81

Jubilees
1:17 199
1:26 199
1:28 199
12:23 177
18:16 177
19:20 177-178
19:27 178
21:25 177-178
22:13 178
22:16 177-178
27:23 177

Pseudo-Phocylides
97-115 85

Psalms of Solomon
3:11-12 126
3:12 87
17:21 103-105
17:26-28 83

Sibyline Oracles
3:797 60
4:181-184 126-127
4:181-183 79, 93
4:181-182 87
5:108-110 104
5:158-161 104
5:414-427 104
5:414-419 109
5:414 109
5:428-433 104

Testament of Job
4:9 87
39:8-10 153
39:12-13 93
39:12 153
40:3 153

Josephus
Ant. Jud.
II, 159 182
XVII, 349-354 93
XVIII, 16 80

Bell. Jud.
I, 648-655 149
I, 650 93, 149
I, 653 149
II, 119 93
II, 154-158 85, 93
II, 162-166 93
II, 163 85
II, 165 80
II, 201 182
III, 372-375 93
III, 374 85
VI, 46-48 93
VII, 341-357 93

Cont. Ap.
II, 217-218 93
II, 218 83, 93

Philo
Sac.
5-6 80

Qumran
1QM 103, 111, 127
4Q246 107
4Q385 87
4Q521 87, 125-126
11QMelch. 101, 111

Early Christian literature

Barnabus
15:9 140

2 Clement
XIX, 3-4 154

Didache
10:6 27

Ignatius
Eph.
XI, 2 147, 154

Magn.
IX, 1-2 154

Pol.
VII, 1 154

Rom.
IV, 2-3 154
VI, 2 141

Smyr.
II 141, 154

Justin Martyr
Apol.
67:7 140

Dial.
36:5 140
53:5 140
85:1 140
97:1 140

Martyrium Andreae
I, 10 154

Martyrium Pauli
IV 154

Martyrium Pionii
XXI, 4 154

Martyrium Polycarpi
IX, 2 154
XIV, 2 147

Polycarp
Phil.
IX, 2 141

Classical authors

Tacitus
Hist.
V 5, 5 155